

METHODIST REVIEW.

(BIMONTHLY.)

WILLIAM V. KELLEY, L.H.D., Editor.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. THE COUNTER-REFORMATION. <i>Bishop J. F. Hurst, LL.D., Washington, D. C.</i>	345
II. THE MUSIC OF THE BIBLE. <i>H. G. Simpson, Los Angeles, Cal.</i>	359
III. THE TWENTIETH CENTURY PREACHER. <i>A. H. Tuttle, D.D., East Orange, N. J.</i>	374
IV. AN INDICTMENT AGAINST MORMONISM. <i>G. E. Ackerman, D.D., Chattanooga, Tenn.</i>	388
V. MISCELLANEOUS PROTESTANT BLUNDERS. <i>C. C. Starbuck, Andover, Mass.</i>	401
VI. ALEXANDER SMITH AND THE "LIFE DRAMA." <i>Joseph Luccock, D.D., Chillicothe, O.</i>	418
VII. JOHN WESLEY, CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST. <i>W. H. Meredith, D.D., Boston, Mass.</i>	426
VIII. THE ARCHEOLOGY OF BAPTISM. <i>Professor A. W. Patten, D.D., Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.</i>	440

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.	452
The Suicide of God, 454; Professor Winchester on the Golden Age of New England Literature, 456.	
THE ARENA.	465
"The Religion of Childhood"—W. R. Goodwin's Criticism, 465; A Word for Lucian, 466; "What Created God?" 468.	
THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.	469
The Preservation of Intellectual Vigor in the Pulpit, 469; The Homiletic Value of the Late Revision—II. Rom. ii, 12, 13; iii, 20, 471.	
ARCHEOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH	474
Cretan Discoveries, 474; The United States and Archaeology, 476; American School at Jerusalem, 477.	
MISSIONARY REVIEW.	478
The Missionary as a Pacifist in China, 478; Religion of Students in Japan, 480; The Distribution of Wealth, 481.	
FOREIGN OUTLOOK.	482
SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.	487
BOOK NOTICES.	491

NEW YORK:
EATON & MAINS.
CINCINNATI:
JENNINGS & PYE.

Subscription Price, Postage Included, \$2.50.

[Entered at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., as second-class mail matter.]



Every Song from cover
to cover *Is Singable*

EVERY NEW SONG IS EASILY LEARNED

It contains Stirring Old Songs that comforted a host that have passed on and make glad the hearts of millions to-day.

The Epworth Hymnal No 3

Every New Song won its place under competition and after trial by a competent chorus and experienced leader.

IT CONTAINS

Opening Services for Young People's Meetings
Opening Services for the Sunday School
Opening Services for the Prayer Meeting

SINGLE COPY, Postpaid, 30 CENTS
TWELVE COPIES OR MORE, Not Prepaid, 25 CENTS EACH

EATON & MAINS, Publishers, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York
JENNINGS & PYE, Cincinnati, O.

METHODIST REVIEW.

MAY, 1901.

ART. I.—THE COUNTER-REFORMATION.

THE term "Counter-Reformation" must not be understood as implying merely a movement in opposition to the Reformation. It was largely that, beyond question, and from our Protestant point of view we can hardly do otherwise than to regard it chiefly in this light. Yet it was also a positive and very important movement of reformation and rejuvenescence within the Roman Catholic Church. It was, indeed, a definitive and determined rejection of the teachings of Luther and Calvin. It was also a rejection of the appeal to the patristic Church on which Anglicanism, although accepting the alliance of continental Protestantism, laid special and increasing weight. The Counter-Reformation resolutely maintained not merely the Catholic system at large as this, for instance, is held by the Greek Church, but the Roman Catholic system in particular as this is defined by the schoolmen, particularly by Thomas Aquinas. Still, within the limits of this system, it was a positive and very energetic movement of reform. The leaders of it, indeed, finally shrunk from pressing the full compass of the reforming propositions laid before Pope Paul III by a commission of cardinals, including even the vehemently Catholic Caraffa, afterward Paul IV.

There were various prerogatives assumed by the Roman *Curia*—for instance, the granting of dispensations of a great many kinds—which, although excessively liable to abuse, were nevertheless seen to be so inextricably interwoven with the Roman claims over the Church that to deal radically with them seemed to involve danger of shattering the whole

machinery of the central administration. Yet even these impregnable prerogatives have unquestionably been vastly restricted in their scope and reduced to the control of a caution and conscientiousness profoundly different from the wanton venality with which they were flaunted in the latter part of the Middle Ages. In the matrimonial causes of the great the Roman *Curia* seems to have retained no small share of its ancient hypocrisy and venality. Yet, speaking generally, the Roman extortionateness—especially as this was displayed after the breaking out of the Great Schism, when there were two and at last three papal courts to keep up—is a thing of the past. The expenses of the papal administration, after the Counter-Reformation gained force, were mainly met by the revenues of the ecclesiastical State, so long as this lasted, and are now chiefly dependent on voluntary contributions. The intrusion of Italians into foreign benefices has been for several centuries unknown. Whatever scandals may here and there hang about the episcopate in some of the Latin countries, especially in South America, yet the general standard of episcopal character is vastly higher than in the time of Leo X. In short, while such a self-controlled hierarchy as the Roman Catholic, cut off from the wholesome safeguards of family life, and so unevangelically dominant over the laity, must always be excessively open to abuses, yet its general tone is vastly more worthy of a Christian Church than in the beginning of the sixteenth century. Of this elevation of character the Counter-Reformation, though not the sole, may well be regarded as the immediately guiding, cause.

The fundamental character of the Reformation is that it is a repristination not of Christianity, to which both sides were equally devoted, but of apostolic Christianity in its deepest form, the Gospel of Paul. His repeated use of "my Gospel" or "our Gospel" seems to show a sense of a profound peculiarity in his preaching, exposing him to vehement attacks from Jewish believers and to occasional qualms on the part even of the twelve, and still more of James, the Lord's brother, who may be regarded, even more than Peter, as representing the Catholic conception of the Gospel as a *nova lex*, in distinction from Paul's great apprehension of it as a gratuitous commu-

nication of a spirit of life. Paul's own churches of the second generation seem already to view Christians rather as servants than as sons. The conception of good works, therefore, as a condition precedent to rewards, rather than as being, in the beautiful language of the Heidelberg Catechism, "the fruits of thankfulness," is already in the first century fast gaining ground. Catholic Christianity to this day, while not denying our adoption as children, shrinks from a free actuation of this very much as the prevailing English Christianity shrank from the cheerful filial confidence of the early Methodists.

Of course, the filial character and consciousness have their own peculiar temptations—presumption, negligence, irreverence. And we all know, though few know in its full extent, the extravagance of the language which Luther used in his rebound from the dejected servilism of the elder system. Doubtless, as Heinrich Heine says, "the sublime brutality of Brother Martin" was necessary to communicate to the Reformation a prevailing headway against the dead weight of the hierarchial Church. Vituperation is assuredly immeasurably less reprehensible than burning people alive. But, whatever advantages this unbounded intemperateness of language may have implied for the Protestant regions, there is no doubt how it must have sounded to Latin Christendom. It violated every instinct of reverence toward Christianity as it had been understood and practiced for at least fourteen hundred years; toward the immemorial hierarchy of the Church; toward that papal majesty which, even in an unworthy man, could, as Catholics held, no more lose the sacredness of its delegation from Christ than Caiaphas lost his divine delegation even by the murder of the Redeemer. To Latin Christendom, accustomed to clearly defined forms of belief, to definite and ancient religious authority, and to a rich affluence of ceremony, the surging, tossing confusion of the North seemed a sheer outbreak of uncontrollable barbarism against Christian civilization. Almost as one man the religious depth, no less than the policy and craft of Italy, and also of Spain—to say nothing of France—rose up against this threatened irruption of Gog and Magog, determined alike to enter into no compromise with the barbarian heretics, to banish alike the sensualism and the freedom

of the Renaissance, to purge away the crying abuses of the Church, to draw tight the reins of the central authority, and to encourage every form of genuine Catholic devotion, ancient or recent, to unfold its fullest capabilities. This profound determination of the Counter-Reformation, at once relentless and fervent, developed itself on one side in persecution, and on the other in rich religious fruitfulness.

The fundamental principle of the Reformation, as we know, is justification by faith alone. Does God gratuitously justify the believing soul, and is holiness the result of this antecedent justification; or does he wait for holiness, and justify on the ground of that, even though that holiness be his own work? Protestantism took the first position; Catholicism the second. Protestantism assumed a wholly unmerited act of God in justifying the sinner, who, in the consciousness of this justification, opens his soul to the divine Spirit, that justification may pass on into sanctification. Justification is the root, sanctification the fruit. The attitude of the soul is from first to last neither passive nor toilsome, but receptively active, working in the strength and joy of God, and appropriating a redemption which it can do nothing to effect. Catholicism, on the other hand, declares that "God is minded to have the fruits of his own grace become the merits of his creatures." There is here, therefore, a strong temptation to tormenting self-examination and to self-originating activity, pleasing itself in the thought of laying up claims against God. Undoubtedly the Catholic position in many approximations has largely invaded Protestantism, particularly in our day. Yet, as Dr. R. W. Dale well says, if it prevails, the whole work of the Reformation will have to be done over again. This question is not an idle speculation; it is the root of the whole spiritual life. Even the vast secular activities of Protestant lands, however adulterated with worldliness, have had their deepest spring in the spirit of filial gladness engendered by the Reformation.

At first there seemed to be hope that justification by faith alone, thus interpreted, might be accepted even by Rome. Two great cardinals—the English prince of the blood, Reginald Pole, following the Teutonic instincts of his race, and the Venetian Gaspar Contarini, imbued with the Venetian

love of the Bible—were zealous on this side. When Pole, years later, became papal legate and the last Roman Catholic archbishop of Canterbury, he was still, as Dr. Fuller says,* “an absolute Protestant on the point of justification.” He used to say, “Too much cannot be taken away from man’s power, nor given to God’s grace.” Yet, after some wavering, Rome and Trent decidedly rejected this higher doctrine of justification, and established the lower. Apparently Pole was saved only by his death from a trial for heresy.

It is true that the Lutheran doctrine was trumpeted in the extravagant and often revolting forms. How could it sound to Catholics when Luther declared that if it were possible for a man to commit adultery in faith he would not be guilty of sin? How easy to turn this into a declaration that to a believer adultery is not a sin. A disciple of Luther declared, “Good works are prejudicial to salvation.” Besides, for two centuries the Reformation was deeply involved in the preposterous assumption that to be justified we must already say, “I believe myself to be justified”—an absurdity to which some schools of Protestants yet cling. Thus, multitudes of tender souls were put under a new yoke, heavier than the old. Yet from the beginning Catholicism had been averse to the free gladness of the evangelical view in itself, apart from all these caricatures of it, so that its final rejection by Trent may be said to have been predetermined from the last years of the first Christian century. Rome has always been afraid of Paul, in spite of honors rendered him. And, as Renan says, there is no Church more incapable of understanding the epistle to the Romans than the Roman Church of to-day.

The Counter-Reformation did not succeed the Renaissance without an undetermined interval. Good Pope Adrian, indeed—Leo’s immediate successor, the plain, frugal Dutchman, not even speaking Italian, chosen by the bewildered cardinals in the first confusions of the Reformation because he was utterly unlike themselves and because he had been the emperor’s tutor—lived too short a time to do anything. He published to all the world, as we know, the most ample acknowledgments of the unbounded corruptions which had flowed out

* *Church History*, book viii, § 50.

over the Church from the Roman See. His plans of reform were most thorough and most sincere, and, could he have lived twenty years, might have given the Counter-Reformation a character far less divergent from the Reformation than it actually assumed. It is even possible, Teuton as he was, that he might have thrown the papal influence decisively on the side of Pole and Contarini, to the higher doctrine of justification. On the other hand, it is perhaps as probable that the Latin episcopate would have risen in its wrath and forced the intruding Fleming out of the sacred chair as an heresiarch in disguise. "What matters it," said the benevolent and godly man, in his epitaph, "that a man has the worthiest aims in an obstinately unworthy age?" We have given an interpretation rather than a transcript, for Adrian VI deserves it.

Clement VII, the illegitimate Medici, Leo's almost immediate successor, was, like his predecessor and cousin, deeply imbued with the sumptuousness and luxury of the Renaissance. Neither in Church nor State was his policy much more elevated than Leo's. Selfish astuteness and magnificence are essential Medicean traits, though this famous race has only produced one monster, Catherine. Yet even in Clement the mighty bulk of the papacy begins to swing about in a new direction. His personal character was blameless, his enjoyment of the religious offices profound, and his rendering of them majestic. The airs of the coming age began to breathe, although they were to be crossed by the contrary currents of more than one pontificate before the full seriousness of the Counter-Reformation was established in control. Under Clement begins that strange relation of the popes to the emperor which lasted well through the century, and whose vicissitudes were of vital service to the Reformation. As heads of the Church, the popes could not fail to be intensely eager for the suppression of the great northern revolt. The only capable instrument of this achievement was the emperor—the secular chief of Christendom, the sovereign of the great Austro-Hungarian dominion, of the Netherlands, of Spain, Sicily, Naples, and Milan, of golden Mexico and Peru, and the federal head of Germany. Yet this very greatness of his power terrified the popes. As Italian princes they were in a vise

between Naples and Milan, while even as chief pontiffs there was danger, if the emperor absolutely crushed the Protestants, that the popes would sink into mere archchaplains of a second Charles the Great. This involved a perpetual and sometimes absolutely ludicrous vacillation between eager pursuit of the Protestants by the pope and secret encouragement of them against Charles V. Humanly speaking, this wavering in the papal policy saved the Reformation, especially as being parallel to a similar fluctuation of Catholic France, which likewise rocked to and fro between her dread of the Protestants and her dread of the emperor. Even after the Hapsburgs divided into a Spanish and an Austrian line, the still subsisting family understanding kept the popes uneasy. These alienations of their policy were principally active under Charles V, before 1555, yet they can hardly be said to have altogether subsided before the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648.

Commonly, where there is a protracted struggle between two powers, it becomes most aggravated toward the end. Poor Clement VII, however, was destined to feel the reverse of this. The most terrible blow from the emperor came upon him in the sack of Rome by the imperial army, with its unspeakable horrors and its infinite spoliation, in 1527. A century of the Renaissance had filled the papal city with an untold affluence of wealth, in its most precious and delicate forms. All this disappeared in a day. The great churches, paintings, statues remained, but every form of opulence took wings. Yet, as the double sack of Alaric and Genseric had lightened Rome for the spiritual leadership of the Middle Ages, so the sack of Rome by the army of the Constable Bourbon left her less alien to the great religious revival of the Counter-Reformation.

Paul III was a mere Renaissance pope, although worthily noted for his energetic seconding of Lasbasas and the Dominicans for the protection of the Indians, forbidding the bull of Alexander VI to be interpreted in any way that should prejudice aboriginal rights. Julius III was of even more dubious reputation, and let the great interests of his office pretty much go by default. Marcellus II was a man of eminent worth and holiness, but like Virgil's Marcellus he was only shown

to the world to be taken out of it. After him the Counter-Reformation became definitely established in control, in the person of the fiery Neapolitan zealot, John Peter Caraffa, who took the name of "Paul IV." Although now seventy-nine years old, his deep-set, blazing eyes betrayed all the energy of youth. His soul was absorbed in the purpose to restore the ancient Church and destroy the Protestants. Happily he had a third passion, very much at variance with this, an invincible hatred of the Spaniards. He was deeply intent on rehabilitating the Italian Inquisition and reestablishing monastic discipline, and on reforming the Church in various ways; but the mutual antipathy between him and the emperor, and to Philip II, which he was incapable of even wishing to restrain, redounded greatly to the benefit of the Reformation. He was a most intense Catholic, but an almost equally intense Italian, and this latter passion setting him against the Spanish king, greatly baffled the hope of future Catholic victories against the Protestants in Germany. He even had the audacity to threaten that Charles and his son should be tried for heresy, a threat which the Spanish Inquisition treated with sovereign contempt. His scornful and furious answer to Elizabeth's respectful notification of her accession, in 1558, sent England away again, this time hopelessly, from the Roman chair. He is a pope to whom we, as Protestants, ought to be profoundly obliged, for although he meant not so, he has certainly done our cause great and lasting service.

Catholicism actually benefited from the fact that Paul's successor, Pius IV, was at heart a calculating, worldly man. Caraffa's furious resentments were at least the expression of a nature that had no private ends. Even his nepotism rested on a sadly miscalculating public zeal, and was abandoned as soon as it disappointed this. He was as unworldly as he was unamiable. But his boiling Neapolitan nature, like that of an earlier Neapolitan, Urban VI, who precipitated the Great Schism, was incapable of all self-restraint. His powerful personality gave a mighty impulse to the determinate victory of Catholic Puritanism over the Renaissance. Yet he wrecked the hopes of Roman Catholicism in England, and did his full part toward wrecking them in northern Germany. His

successor, Cardinal Medici of Milan—in no way related to the great Florentine princes—a cool commercial Italian of the north, was just the man to redress Caraffa's mistakes. He understood the rising spirit of religious earnestness, and promoted it without ever being really inspired by it. His cold-blooded execution of one thousand five hundred Waldenses in Calabria, although it seems to have exceeded many fold all the Italian persecutions of Caraffa, was so managed as scarcely to have made an impression on history. In Rome itself he very decidedly tempered the inquisitorial severity of his predecessor. His own want of real devoutness was largely covered by the wonderful unworldliness and sanctity of his nephew, Saint Charles Borromeo, archbishop of Milan.

Charles was the consummate flower of the Counter-Reformation. His intense Catholicism led him to cling still, in theory, not in practice, to the mediæval tenet that a proclaimed heretic, like a proclaimed traitor, may lawfully be killed by anyone. His Catholicism also led him to count it no waste of time when he consecrated three hundred altars in his diocese, each consecration taking up eight solid hours. On the other hand, he was embodied purity, unworldliness, heavenly-mindedness, benevolence toward all men, high and low. In the time of a great plague he wore himself out in offices of love, and died at forty-six. He was also a model of episcopal energy and wisdom, and has for the whole Roman Catholic Church permanently raised the standard of pastoral devotion. The Nonconformist monument in London worthily places his name at the head of Sunday school workers. Dr. Arthur T. Pierson's little portraiture of him is a jewel of ecclesiastical biography. His younger cousin and ultimate, though not immediate, successor in the archbishopric, Cardinal Frederic—portrayed in Manzoni's great romance, *I Promessi Sposi*—almost literally reduplicated his kinsman's episcopate, even to the great plague, and seems to have been of yet deeper piety and benevolence. Thus the elevation of the worldly Pius IV, in setting forward his nephews, seems to have opened in Italy the purest and most refreshing fountains of Catholic piety.

Constance and Basel, with their lofty and, for the former, its successful, assertions of superiority for the collective

Church over the papacy had taught Rome to hate the very name of "General Council." Yet Paul III in 1545 had yielded to Charles's peremptory urgency, and had consented to assemble one. Trent, in the Tyrol, was chosen for the locality—an imperial city, it is true, but Italian in speech and feeling. Care was taken to give the Italians a large majority over all the others together. The votes were no longer, as at Constance, by nations, but individual. The cardinals and monastic generals peculiarly attached to Rome were, even though not bishops, allowed to vote. To the papal legates was assigned a control over the proceedings hardly less stringent than at Rome in 1870. The Council, it is true, could not be persuaded to define the papal prerogatives, or even to say that the papacy is of divine right. Yet practically it was as obsequious as theoretically it remained independent. As Herzog-Plitt remarks, the Vatican Council had but little to do but to crown the work of Trent.

In doctrine Trent was obstinately hostile to Protestantism at every point. The freedom of the elder Western Church, which, content with practice, left alternate theories very much at liberty, was here narrowed down to a determinate Roman Catholic denomination. Justification was defined by only sixty prelates, not one a German. The Apocrypha were definitely canonized; the Vulgate was declared not, indeed, inspired, or exempt from errors of translation, but sufficient and final for the determination of doctrine. Primitive tradition was declared equally authoritative with Scripture. All sorts of prerogatives which the Church had practiced, including the right of forbidding priests to marry, were established on articles of faith. At not one point does there appear the slightest concession to Protestant scruples, opinions, or claims. Absolute submission or permanent excision are the only alternatives offered. The hand of Rome is seen throughout. Indulgences are very guardedly defined, and the traffic in them forbidden. Outside of Spain there has been little of it since. Purgatory is defined in very mild and general terms, but practically, in the Latin countries at least, the grossness of mediæval superstitions concerning it is hardly abated. Within these sharply defined limits, the Council of Trent was vigor-

ously reformatory. It enlarged episcopal rights against monastic encroachments; enforced episcopal and pastoral residence; provided for better training of the clergy; set on foot catechetical instruction; and passed a great many reforming edicts touching laymen, monks, nuns, priests, and bishops. It nowhere descended to the deep springs of spiritual renewal, but it provided for a wise disposal of the spiritual forces already at hand. On the other hand, it instituted a rigid censorship of books, and did its best to promote the long contest of the Roman Catholic priesthood against the mental emancipation of mankind. Accordingly, the deeper thought and research of Catholic countries have either been quenched or have inclined to actuate themselves in hostility to the Church. The doctrinal decrees of Trent, when papally ratified, were of force at once, *proprio vigore*. Disciplinary decrees, however, take effect only by publication in each country, and indeed in each diocese. Accordingly, these latter decrees of Trent have been received in very varying proportions in different regions. Yet on the whole the Tridentine legislation, modified by later popes and assumed in all papal transactions, has controlled ecclesiastical administration, and, save for its restrictions on freedom of thought, has been generally beneficial.

The great organ of the Counter-Reformation, however, was the militant Spanish institute of the Company of Jesus. Its founder, the warlike Biscayan nobleman, Ignatius Loyola, gave it this military title, not as having, like the Salvation Army, a military organization—the title “General” is a mere abridgment of “General Superior”—but because he wished its members to esteem themselves in an eminent degree the soldiers of Christ. He also exalted the military duty of obedience, not indeed to quite the height commonly assumed, but perilously near it. The order was founded at Paris in 1534, and papally confirmed in 1540. The aim of the Society of Jesus—*Societas* being a rude Latin translation of the Spanish *Compañía*—was to advance mediæval Catholicism, concentrated in the papacy, by weapons adapted to grapple with the Renaissance and with the Reformation. Therefore it has always combined fixedness and flexibility to a degree that has

made it the marvel and often the terror and the horror of the world. No association has had more genuine saints, and none more unscrupulous politicians* whose wiliness has been covered by the sacred simplicity of their colleagues. What has been said of Roman Catholicism at large is eminently true of this quintessence of it, that it is a masterpiece of God, man, and the devil. Only the eyes that are as a flame of fire will ever be able to resolve its good and its evil.

Jesuitism, casting aside all cumbersome monastic observances, debilitating austerities, and distinguishing attire, holding each member ready for any service as spiritual ruler, preacher, teacher, scholar, confessor, missionary, took at once the whole conduct of the Counter-Reformation. Ultimately favoring moral laxity, it began by breaking the yoke of moral rigorism. Highly favored by the aristocracy, it warmly pleaded the cause of the people, and had much to do with the ultimate triumphs of democracy. Intensely Catholic, Pelagianizing, and ceremonial, it was yet so deeply imbued with the new influences that the old Church under its lead renewed her conquering confidence. As Macaulay says,† by the end of the sixteenth century Catholicism was hardly safe on the shores of the Mediterranean. Before the middle of the seventeenth Protestantism was hardly safe on the shores of the Baltic. The Thirty Years' War, ending in 1648, and costing Germany half her population, and Bohemia at least two thirds of hers, put a term by mutual exhaustion to these mutual aggressions. Since then there has been in Europe generally but little fluctuation in the boundaries of the two creeds.

In Pius V, reigning from 1566 to 1572, the Counter-Reformation reached its papal culmination. He had been grand inquisitor of Rome, and had never been known to mitigate a capital sentence. Less furious than Caraffa, he was still more inexorably and searchingly severe against heresy; yet toward Catholicism he was mildness and benevolence itself. Profoundly devout and unworldly, he was personally as simple and humble as a child. Under him Rome, allowing for its so much greater population, became as gravely devout as Geneva,

* Globerti: *Il Gesuita moderno*, tomo secondo, p. 158.

† So, in substance, in his Essay on "Ranke's History of the Popes."

and hardly less austere moral. This character it long retained. Savonarola would have rejoiced could he have beheld the change that had passed over the Italian cities. It is not strange then that, under Pius V, Rome solemnly absolved Savonarola's memory from all taint of heresy. Pius, indeed, might almost be called a Savonarola in the papal chair—a greatly reduced Savonarola, it is true, for there was a largeness about the Florentine friar of which there are no traces in Michael Ghislieri. Pius V is the one pope since 1313 whom Rome has thought worthy of canonization. Ghislieri is the last pope that, in his bull against Queen Elizabeth, has undertaken to depose an actually reigning sovereign, and the last to excommunicate a king or queen by name. Napoleon, Victor Emmanuel, and Humbert have been merely excommunicated by inference. The bull of Pius against Elizabeth, determined but dignified, was very effective, but brought down the bolts of persecution upon the English Roman Catholics.

After the politic and temperate Gregory XIII, the reformer of the calendar, Sixtus V, from 1585 to 1590 conducted the Counter-Reformation with rude peasant energy, but with thoroughly disciplined judgment. He knew just when to advance and when to pause. He blessed the Invincible Armada that was to reconquer England, but out of the vast papal treasure would not advance a crown toward it until it should have succeeded. When it was hopelessly shattered he at least took comfort in his own prudence. The course of Roman Catholic missions in England went on, and for many years, with great results, but all serious thought of reconquering England as a nation seems to have slowly waned away.

In Germany, Catholicism led by the Jesuits and the princes reconquered Austria and most of the South, and at last, in 1618, advanced in military force against the North and against Bohemia. The latter kingdom was almost depopulated, and its Protestantism completely crushed. In the North the intervention of the Swedish hero, Gustavus Adolphus, and after his death of the French statesman, Cardinal Richelieu, finally checked the Catholic advance and left Protestantism—leaving out the Austrian provinces—with about two thirds of the population as proportions are now. Of this most fearful of

wars Archbishop Trench assigns three causes—the despotism of the Catholic princes, the intrigues of the Jesuits, the utterly loveless spirit of Protestant controversy with Rome. The third cause may well be pondered by us, much of whose popular controversy with Rome, as has been well said, breathes the very spirit of a religious war.

In Antigua, a generation back, appeared a strange disease on the cocoanut trees. They grew healthily until they reached a man's height, and were then stopped by an invincible web of blight. Even so, for all those strata of Italian and Spanish—and more or less of other—countries that were not much troubled with thinking the Counter-Reformation was a deep and lasting religious benefit. But minds and characters above mediocrity were, by no means universally, but only too generally, under its iron restraint, smitten with decay. Whether Catholicism in our day can burst these limits and, retaining its distinctiveness but losing its confining mediævalism, enter into a more generous and believing future remains to be seen.

John F. Hurst

ART. II.—THE MUSIC OF THE BIBLE.

IN the days when "music, heavenly maid, was young," there were, according to one theory advanced, three stages of development. The first brought the class known as percussion instruments, consisting of drums, cymbals, and tambourines, as well as the ancient tabret. The second gave the world wind instruments—as the pipe, flute, organ, clarinet, and trumpet. The third brought the highest class, that is, such stringed instruments as the harp and violin. The piano belongs to the first and third classes.

This theory is worth considering. Percussion instruments undoubtedly came first, for it is well known that the pulsations of music affect persons of the lowest intelligence, while many of higher mental force are sometimes unable to distinguish between two very different melodies. The clapping of hands and stamping of feet probably originated this class of instruments, which could also be more easily made and played. Wind instruments would naturally come next. The wind sighing over a bed of reeds or whistling through the trees must have suggested sounds worthy to be imitated. The same reed over which the wind sighed was fashioned into the primitive pipe, and later pipes were bound together to form the Pandean pipes. The warrior loved his bow and, as he twanged its cord, was pleased with the sound and resolved to utilize it for a gentler art than war. The harp was the result. This theory may or may not be correct, but it at least furnishes us with a convenient grouping of instruments into three great classes in the order of their importance.

In general terms we may say that the Hebrews derived their music from the Egyptians, as did the Greeks and Romans. The first mention of music in the Bible is in Gen. iv, 21, where Jubal is characterized as "the father of all such as handle the harp and organ;" and thence, throughout the Scripture, there are numerous references to music, for the love of melody led the Hebrews to burst into song on any occasion of joy or sorrow. Solomon speaks of their musical instruments as "the delights of the sons of men." The birth

of a Jewish boy was celebrated with music, and when he was laid away in the sepulcher his friends and numerous hired mourners gave vent to their grief in melancholy strains, so that, literally, from the cradle to the grave the Hebrew lived in an atmosphere of music. It is recorded that four thousand musicians were employed in the temple services, while Josephus writes that later the number was raised to two hundred thousand trumpeters and forty thousand players on harps and other stringed instruments. Possibly these numbers are exaggerated, but we are at least sure that music held a wonderfully high place among this venerable people.

Mistranslations.—Unfortunately the translation of the names of instruments and of musical terms in the Bible is often erroneous. One English word is often used to indicate different Hebrew instruments which are sometimes very diverse in character and use. Among those of the percussion class we find three terms, *metziltiam*, *tziltzelim*, and *shalishim*, which are severally translated “cymbals.” Among wind instruments three words, *keren*, *shophar*, and *chatzotzerah* are all translated “trumpet.” The second, *shophar*, is also translated “shawm.” *Keren* and *shophar* are both translated “cornet,” which also translates *mena'an'im*. The “dulcimer” of Dan. iii, 5, 10, 15, should be “bagpipe.” The word translated “flute” is very doubtful. “Pipe” translates three words, *chalil*, *machol*—which denotes either a percussion instrument or a smaller pipe—and *machalath*. The translation of the names of stringed instruments is even more misleading. “Harp” translates four different words, *kinnor*, *nebel*, *asor*, and *kaithros*. *Nebel*, the second, is also translated “lute,” “psaltery,” and “viol.” The “sackbut” of Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15, was probably a small harp with a large number of strings, giving a full rich tone.

Instruments of Percussion.—Bells (Heb., *metzilloth*), it seems, were not used in a strictly musical way; yet their use so nearly approached this that it may not be profitless to give them some consideration. Their most marked use was upon the robes of the high priest, who wore seventy-two golden bells about the hem of his ephod. Their purpose, it is explained in the case of Aaron, was that “his sound shall be

heard when he goeth into the holy place before the Lord, and when he cometh out, that he die not." In Zech. xiv, 20, occurs the passage, "In that day there shall be upon the bells of the horses, HOLINESS UNTO THE LORD." The so-called "bells" were likely flat or slightly hollowed plates of brass, attached to the harness for the sake of ornament or because of the agreeable tinkling. The Authorized Version in the margin gives "bridles," it being perhaps customary to ornament bridles in that way. It is also a modern, as well as an ancient, custom for the women of Eastern countries to wear bells about their ankles.

There are two kinds of cymbals * mentioned in Psalm cl, the "loud cymbals" and the "high sounding cymbals." The difference, no doubt, was in the size of the hollow in each brass plate. The "high sounding" cymbals, being smaller and much more concave, were struck sharply together in accompaniment, as we use cymbals to-day. They were employed by the Hebrew women in their national dances.

The timbrel and the tabret † (Hebrew, *toph*; Greek, *τύμπανον*), instruments of Egyptian origin, were the same, and were practically no different from our tambourines. They were used very largely by the women. We read of them in Exod. xv, 20, where Miriam "took a timbrel in her hand," accompanied by the women; in Judg. xi, 34, where Jephthah's daughter "came out to meet him with timbrels and with dances;" in 1 Sam. xviii, 6, where "the women came out of all cities of Israel, singing and dancing, to meet king Saul, with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music;" and in Psa. lxxviii, 25, where we learn that in processions "the singers went before, the players on instruments followed after," among them being "the damsels playing with timbrels." The tabret, or timbrel, was a very popular instrument at social festivities. It was used in very early times by the Syrians of Padan-aram at merrymakings. Laban said to

* Two Hebrew words are translated, "cymbals:" 1. *Metziltiam* (Greek, *κίμβαλα*), 1 Chron. xv, 16, 19, 28; xvi, 5, 42; xxv, 6; 2 Chron. v, 13; xxix, 25; Neh. xii, 27; Ezra iii, 10. 2. *Tziltzelim* (Greek, *κίμβαλα*), 2 Sam. vi, 5; Psa. cl, 5.

† 1 Sam. x, 5; 2 Sam. vi, 5; Isa. xxiv, 8; Job xxi, 12; Ezek. xxviii, 13; Jer. xxxi, 4; Psa. lxxxi, 2; cxlix, 3; cl, 4.

Jacob, "Wherefore didst thou flee away secretly, and steal away from me; and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth, and with songs, with tabret, and with harp?" Isaiah, in an invective against the house of Israel, tells us that "the harp and the viol, the tabret and pipe,* and wine, are in their feasts;" and in another place he says that, when the judgment of the Lord falls on the land, "the mirth of tabrets ceaseth." The tabret was also a token of peace and joy. In Job xxi, 12, we read, "They take the timbrel and harp, and rejoice at the sound of the organ." In Isa. xxx, 32, it is written, "And in every place where the grounded staff shall pass, which the Lord shall lay upon him, it shall be with tabrets and harps: and in battles of shaking will he fight with it." And Jeremiah, speaking of the restoration of Israel, says, "Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel: thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry." We thus see that the tabret was also an article for feminine adornment.

The *sistrum*,† also of Egyptian origin, was used to a large extent in the same manner as the tabret, and was also employed in the temple service to notify the worshipers that the solemn moment had arrived—a purpose now served by bells. It consisted of a loop of metal attached to a handle and having loose bars which were run through the loop. It was shaken vigorously by the handle.

The Hebrew word *machol* ‡ is generally rendered "dance" in the Septuagint and the Authorized Version. The Authorized Version, however, in one marginal reference denotes "dance" as a "pipe." It was really an instrument of the percussion class, used in very early times by the Hebrews. We read of it in Exod. xv, 20, where "all the women went out after her [Miriam] with timbrels and dances," and in Jer. xxxi, 13,

* Note the expression "tabret and pipe." It seems clear that they were companion instruments.

† In 1 Sam. xviii, 6, where the women came down "to meet king Saul, with tabrets, with joy, and with instruments of music," the phrase "instruments of music" translates the Hebrew *shalishim*, which occurs only here in the Bible. The Revised Version in the margin gives "triangles, or three-stringed instruments." It seems probable that *sistra* are meant.

‡ Psa. xxx, 11; cxlix, 3.

where he says, "Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance." It is mentioned among the instruments of praise in Psalm cl. It is thought to have been made of metal in the form of a circle, perhaps with a row of bells around it. Women played it, and used it as an accompaniment to their singing at weddings and merrymakings. By some, however, the instrument is thought to have been a small flute used with the tabret for dancing.

Wind Instruments.—The word * translated "organ" in the Authorized Version in Gen. iv, 21; Job xxi, 12; xxx, 31, means perhaps a pipe or reed flute. Possibly it refers to a box with tubes attached, on the principle of the modern organ, and operated by a bellows. Such an instrument was known in ancient Egypt. Its greatest use was in the temple, especially in rendering the Hallel, that is, Psalms cxiii-cxviii. Some identify it with the Pandean pipes.

The Hebrew word † translated "pipe" comes from a root meaning "to bore, perforate," and hence we may conclude that it was a very simple instrument. Its wonderful popularity and adaptability lead us to the same conclusion. The oldest form was a sort of oboe made from a reed, in which the mouthpiece was at the end.‡ There were many other varieties also, some being made of bone. Isaiah speaks of the pipe in reference to lightness of heart, "as when one goeth up with a pipe to come into the mountain of the Lord, to the Mighty One of Israel." It was used at great public demonstrations. At the anointing of Solomon it is recorded that "all the people came up after him, and the people piped with pipes, and rejoiced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them." Though perhaps not used in the temple itself, the pipe also had a prominent place in processions, it being said of these, "The singers went before, the players of instruments followed after; among them were the damsels playing with timbrels." In Ps. lxxxvii, 7, where this is alluded to, "players of instruments" should be "pipers."

* *Ugab*; Greek, ψαλμός, ὄργανον.

† *Chalil*; Greek, αὐλός. Another word translated "pipe" (*machalath*; Greek, μαχλήθ) occurs in the titles of Psalms lili and lxxxviii. It probably refers to instruments of accompaniment. Gesenius translates it "lute."

‡ 1 Kings i, 40; Isa. v, 12; xxx, 29. In Amos vi, 5, it is rendered "instruments of music."

Nor can we forget the passage, "They are like unto children sitting in the market place, and calling one to another, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept." This little instrument served not only those who rejoiced, but those who mourned as well. Jeremiah, lamenting for Moab, cries, "Therefore mine heart shall sound for Moab like pipes, and mine heart shall sound like pipes for the men of Kir-heres; because the riches that he hath gotten are perished." It also adapted itself to the saddest and most sacred of uses—the burial rite, "And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the minstrels [literally, 'pipers;'] the original is *ὀλῆταις*] and the people making a noise, he said unto them, Give place: for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth." A rabbinical rule required at least two flute players and one mourning woman in such cases.

The word (Chaldee, *mashrokitha*; Greek, *σῦριξ*) which is translated "flute" in Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15, occurs only in these passages* from the ancient prophet, and the nature of the musical instrument named is hard to be determined. Some authorities describe it as a "double flute;" some as Pandean pipes, and some as an "organ"—with the final conclusion as to its character yet to be made.

Trumpet and Cornet.—These instruments, aside from their use on the field of battle, were employed by the priests to assemble the people and by heralds to announce the approach of a monarch, though, even as late as 59 A. D., the trumpet is spoken of in 1 Cor. xiv, 8, as distinctively a war instrument. The priests, as distinguished from the trained Levites, did not play or sing, and necessarily could use only a simple instrument; hence they very largely employed the trumpet and cornet. The sound of the trumpet was deeper and more hoarse than that of the cornet, which was high and clear, like a bugle. The primitive trumpet was the horn of a ram or chamois, as in Josh. vi, 4. That which

* These much quoted references have to do with the music of the Assyrians, rather than with that of the Hebrews. The story of Nannarus mentions one hundred and fifty female musicians, singers, and players of instruments. Among the instruments mentioned are those referred to in Daniel. Sculpture could hardly depict so large a band, but a bas-relief of a date somewhat earlier than Nebuchadnezzar's time shows twenty-six performers. The Assyrians had eight or nine different instruments. See *Egypt and Babylonia*, Rawlinson.

sounded when Moses was on Mount Sinai was a long, slender horn, turned up at the end; it was much used for stirring up religious and patriotic enthusiasm. The *chatzotzerah*,* a straight trumpet of silver ending in a bell, was that which Moses was commanded to make, and the use of which was so minutely described in Num. x, 1-10. One hundred and twenty of these were sounded at Solomon's dedication.

The *shophar*† was the instrument Gideon placed in the hands of his three hundred chosen men when he used the stratagem of the trumpets, lamps, and pitchers against the Midianites. This was also the trumpet which Ehud blew in the mountains of Ephraim. In 1 Chron. xv, 28, and Psa. xcviii, 6, it is rendered "cornet." In the version of the Book of Common Prayer it is "shawm." *Keren* (Greek, *σάλπιγξ*), in Dan. iii, is translated "cornet." It seldom occurs, and is generally called a "horn." "Cornets" ‡ in 2 Sam. vi, 5, is the translation of *mena'an'im* § (Greek, *αὐλοί*). The Revised Version has "castanets," marg. "*sistra*." It generally translates *keren*. The "feast of trumpets"—Lev. xxiii, 24—was a day of blowing of trumpets. The "dulcimer" of Dan. iii, 5, 10, 15, is simply a bagpipe.

Stringed Instruments.—The principal instruments of this class in use among the Hebrews were the harp and psaltery. The psaltery bore a great resemblance to the Grecian lyre. The word translated "psaltery" in Kings, Chronicles, and Psalms is "*nebel*," which is a form of the harp and will be considered later. They probably had the soprano register, for in 1 Chron. xv, 20, we read that certain Levites were appointed to sound with psalteries "on Alamothe"—the latter term meaning "in the manner of maidens," that is, "soprano."

* 2 Sam. vi, 5, 15; 1 Chron. xiii, 8; 2 Chron. xv, 14; xx, 28; 2 Kings xi, 14; Psa. xcvi, 6.

† Greek, *σωφῆρ*, *σάλπιγξ*, *κερατινή*; Joel ii, 1; Psa. xlvii, 5; lxxxi, 3; xcvi, 6.

‡ 2 Chron. xv, 14; Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15; Hos. v, 8; Psa. xcvi, 6.

§ The word only occurs in this passage, and in conjunction with "cymbals," though translated "cornets" in the Authorized Version and "pipes" in the Septuagint. The Hebrew word is supposed to be derived from a root meaning "to sway to and fro," or "vibrate;" hence it is thought that the Vulgate rendering, *sistra*, is more correct, and that it was a rattle—very common in the East—consisting of an oval loop with a handle, having crossbars of metal rods, on which loose rings were threaded, jingling when shaken, like the plates of a timbrel.—*Oxford Sunday School Teacher's Bible*.

In the next verse we read that certain other Levites were appointed to sound with harps "on the Sheminith." This word means "eighth," and hence it is supposed that the octave lower is referred to. It seems that the psaltery and harp were sometimes made of fir wood, for "David and all the house of Israel played before the Lord on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries." But Solomon "made of the alnum trees terraces to the house of the Lord, and to the king's palace, and harps and psalteries for singers: and there were none such seen before in the land of Judah." The psaltery that Daniel mentions as having been played before Nebuchadnezzar's golden image in the plain of Dura should be translated "dulcimer," as the instrument there mentioned was very much like the modern zither, except that the strings, of which there were ten, were struck with a hammer or *plectrum*. It was the germ of the modern piano, the *plectrum* being an invention that is credited to Sappho, the great poetess of the Greeks.

The harp proper, being, as stated before, of lower range than the psaltery, necessarily had longer strings, and perhaps in some way corresponded to our bass viol. The general term "harp" includes three instruments. The first—the *kinnor*,* of Syrian origin—was the most ancient. It is described as a "triangular lyre, formed of two flat pieces of wood, whose ends were united with eight or nine animal strings." It was held under the left arm, and played by the fingers or with a *plectrum*. Josephus records that it had ten strings and was played with a *plectrum*, making no mention of its being played with the fingers. In 1 Sam. xvi, 23, we are distinctly told that "David took a harp, and played with his hand." This is the instrument which was hung on the willows of Babylon.

The second kind—*nebel*,† a later instrument of Phœnician

* Gen. iv, 21; Job xxi, 12; xxx, 31; Psa. cxxxvii, 2; Isa. v, 12. The word *kinnor* is thought to be Phœnician, which leads many to suppose that the instrument is of Phœnician origin. This is clearly not the case, however, for Phœnicia was not in existence for several centuries after the time of Jubal, in connection with whom the instrument is first mentioned. It may be that the name was applied to Jubal's instrument long after the times covered by the narrative.

† 1 Sam. x, 5; 2 Sam. vi, 5; 1 Chron. xiii, 8; xv, 16; xxv, 1; 2 Chron. v, 12; xxix, 25; Psa. xxxlii, 2; lxxi, 22; lvii, 8; lxxxii, 2; xcii, 3; ci, 3; Isa. v, 12; Neh. xii, 27. *Nebel* is translated "psaltery" wherever it occurs, except in Isa. v, 12; xiv, 11; Amos v, 23; vi, 5, in which places it is translated "viol."

origin—had three sides, one curved, and ten strings. This is the instrument already mentioned in connection with the psaltery. It was there stated that probably it was of the soprano register, and the fact that it was generally played with some other instrument would seem to strengthen this supposition. *Nebel* is also translated "lute" and "viol," the ancient viol being a six-stringed guitar.

A third kind of harp—the *asor*, referred to in Psa. xxxiii, 2; cxliv, 9; a smaller instrument of Assyrian origin—is mentioned only with *nebel*. Perhaps it supplied the bass, but that is very doubtful, as it was smaller in size than the *nebel*. It is more likely that it took a sort of alto part.

It is thought by some that "sackbut,"* in Dan. iii, should be translated "harp." The latter word in these passages is a translation of the Chaldaic *kaithros* (compare Greek *κιθάρις*, Latin *cithara*, A. S. *cytere*, Eng. "cithern," "guitar"). This was a four-stringed lyre which was imported into the East from Greece.†

The tone of the harp was soothing in its effect; for "when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, . . . David took a harp, and played with his hand: so Saul was refreshed, and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him." This harp—*kinnor*—is the same as that mentioned in connection with Jubal, a thousand years before. The harp was the leading instrument of the Levitical orchestra. Certain Levites were appointed to sound with harps "on the Sheminith to excel [that is, to lead]." The chief harper was therefore the director. The harp, it may be observed, is the only stringed instrument mentioned in the Pentateuch.

Vocal Music.—The vocal music of the Hebrews is perhaps of more interest to us than the instrumental. The Hebrews were a nation of singers; they sang on occasions of every kind. We find that among them the singing was done almost entirely by men at first, while later it was done almost entirely by women. "Women singers," even in those early days, made trouble. The son of Sirach, in the Apocrypha, says, "Be-

* The word is the Chaldaic *sabbecca*. The sackbut was a wind instrument.

† Strabo tells us of a Greek who served in Nebuchadnezzar's army. Several like incidents incline us to the thought that Assyria may have derived her instruments in a more or less direct way from Greece.

ware of female singers, that they entice thee not with their charms." One of the earliest expressions of rejoicing was the song of Miriam, "Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously;" and, at a later time, "when David was returned from the slaughter of the Philistine, . . . the women came out of all cities of Israel, singing and dancing . . . with joy." Social festivities were enlivened with vocal music. In Gen. xxxi, 27, already referred to, Laban reproached Jacob for fleeing away without giving him an opportunity to speed the parting guest "with mirth, and with songs." Amos, in condemning the hypocritical feasts of Israel, cried out, "Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs."* The older brother of the prodigal son, "as he came and drew nigh to the house . . . heard music and dancing."† Great triumphs were celebrated with a song. The grape gatherers and laborers at the wine presses enlivened their toil with singing. A love song is found in Isa. v, 1, and Psa. xlv is a "song of loves." The marriage festivities were enlivened with singing. Music was also turned to idolatrous purposes, for Joshua heard the "noise" of them that sang and danced before Aaron's golden calf. Isaiah affords us an interesting and instructive picture in chapter xxiii, 15, 16: "After the end of seventy years shall Tyre sing as a harlot. Take a harp, go about the city, thou harlot that hast been forgotten; make sweet melody, sing many songs, that thou mayest be remembered." Amos bitterly denounces the wantonness and effeminacy of Israel—they "that chant to the sound of the viol, and invent to themselves instruments of music, like David." The power of music in arousing patriotism was well understood by Jehoshaphat, who, "when he had consulted with the people, . . . appointed singers unto the Lord, and that should praise the beauty of holiness, as they went out before the army." This was the occasion when the riches of the enemy were so great that Jehoshaphat's army was three days in gathering up the spoils.

From the very earliest ages music has been the handmaid of religion. Max Müller pictures the prehistoric Aryan fam-

* Note the sarcasm in "noise." For other instances of this sarcastic use of the word, see Exod. xxxii, 18; Ezek. xxvi, 13.

† Συμψαλίας, "music;" καὶ χορῶν, "and dancing together with singing."

ilies as gathered about their altars at early morning and singing or intoning, with hands upraised, their chant to the god of the sun. This union of music and worship was peculiarly characteristic of the Hebrews.* We are told that, after David had "made him houses in the city of David, and prepared a place for the ark of God, and pitched for it a tent," he made arrangements to have the Levites carry it to its place and minister before it. His arrangements in regard to the music are then described at length, and were elaborate. Among all else he assigned a large body of musicians to each of the chief musicians, Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun. The whole "number of them, with their brethren that were instructed in the songs of the Lord, even all that were cunning, was two hundred fourscore and eight." These were divided into twenty-four groups, generally of twelve each, who assumed charge of the musical part of the services in turn.

In the eighteenth year of his reign Josiah prepared a solemn passover. Great preparations were made. The king and the leading men all gave freely of their substance, that it might be a success. "And the singers the sons of Asaph were in their place, according to the commandment of David, and Asaph, and Heman, and Jeduthun the king's seer; and the porters waited at every gate; they might not depart from their service." This compulsory attendance of the musicians shows us how important their services were considered. In this instance "there was no passover like to that kept in Israel from the days of Samuel the prophet."

Women took occasional part in the temple services. In the second temple the whole congregation did not usually sing, but joined in the amen. In the Hallel they repeated the first line of each verse, and after the second line fell in with the "Hallelujah." At the dedication of the city wall Nehemiah appointed "two great companies of them that gave thanks." By many this is considered an instance of "antiphonal" singing, the first instance of "antiphonal"—more correctly "alternate"—singing seeming to be the song of Miriam's company of women in answer to the song of the men, when *Exod.* xv, 1, was sung by men, and verse 20 by women, in answer.

* 1 Chron. vi, 32; xv, 16, 19; xvi, 5; 2 Sam. xix, 35; Ezra ii, 65; 2 Chron. v, 13.

Another early example seems to be the singing of the women in 1 Sam. xviii, 7, where they "answered one another as they played, and said, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands." Alternate singing was also performed in such cases as in Psalms xxix and cxxi.

The services when "man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets," as has before been suggested, were incomplete without singing. We read that after Josiah was killed Jeremiah lamented for him, "and all the singing men and the singing women spake of Josiah in their lamentations." And Amos says, "They shall call the husbandman to mourning, and such as are skillful of lamentation to wailing." Many, especially women, made a profession of mourning at funerals or other solemn occasions, and must have been very successful at inducing sadness, for Jeremiah calls for "mourning women," and adds, "Send for cunning women, that they may come: and let them make haste, and take up a wailing for us, that our eyes may run down with tears, and our eyelids gush out with waters."

The Psalms.—From a musical standpoint these compositions present many features of interest. The word "psalm" (*ψαλμός*) has two meanings. The first is the music of a stringed instrument; the second a song sung to the accompaniment of such music. The Hebrew, *mizmor*, rendered "psalm," is prefixed to fifty-seven psalms and denotes a psalm with the accompaniment of instruments. *Shir*, meaning "a song," and either preceding or following *mizmor*, is the general term for a song. It occurs thirty times in the titles of the psalms. "Shiggaion," the title of Psalm vii, comes from a verb meaning "to wander away," and is supposed to refer to the musical setting, indicating no doubt a much freer, perhaps an agitated, style of music. The prayer of Habakkuk is "set to Shigionoth." There are fifty-five psalms to or for "the chief musician." "Selah" occurs seventy-one times in the Psalms and three times in Habakkuk. Almost all the psalms in which "Selah" appears are "for the chief musician," and no doubt were intended to be sung. If this is the case, "Selah" is clearly a musical term. The word is of so great antiquity that its meaning is lost. Hebrew tradition gives it

the meaning "forever," which has the disadvantage of not "making sense." Modern research derives the word from a root meaning "to raise." This would signify a louder accompaniment, or an interlude during a pause by the singers.

The titles of many of the psalms refer to musical setting or instruments:

"On Neginoth" (iv; vi; liv; lxvii; lxxvi) means "on stringed instruments."

"On Neginah" (lxi) means "on a stringed instrument."

"On Nehiloth" (v) means "on wind instruments," probably flutes.

"On Alamoth" (xlv) is supposed to mean "for maidens' voices"—that is, soprano.

"On the Sheminith—that is, "eighth"—(vi; xii) no doubt means the octave lower, referring to tenor or bass.

"On Gittith" (viii; lxxxi; lxxxiv). This is a feminine adjective from Gath, and refers either to some Gittite instrument or to a Gittite song.

"To Jeduthun," or, as the Revised Version has it, "after the manner of Jeduthun" (lxii; lxxvii), probably refers to a melody composed by Jeduthun, or to some peculiarity of his in rendering the music. In the title of Psalm xxxix Jeduthun is given emphasis by the words "To the chief Musician, *even* to Jeduthun."

We find that much of the music of the temple services was adapted from the popular songs of the time, since many of the titles of the psalms are taken from the names of tunes or from the first words of songs. Psalm xxii is set to the tune *Aijeleth Shahar*, "the hind of the morning." Psalms xlv and lxix are set to *Shoshannim*, "the tune of the lilies." Psalm lx is set to *Shushan-eduth*, "the lily of testimony." Psalm lxxx is set to *Shoshannim-Eduth*, "lilies, a testimony." Psalm lvi is set to *Jonath-elm-rechokim*, "the silent dove of them afar." Psalms lvii, lix, and lxxv are set to *Al-taschith*, "Do not destroy." This is also thought to be the vintage song of Isa. lxxv, 8. Psalm ix is set to *Muth-labben*, "Die for the son"—but this latter is considered doubtful.

Schools of Music.—Up to the time of David we find but few traces of a systematic cultivation of music. In the schools of the prophets which Samuel organized, music seems to have been cultivated. We are given a hint that David had "singing men and singing women" about him, for Barzillai,

when pressed to make his home with David, said, "I am this day fourscore years old: . . . can I hear any more the voice of singing men and singing women? wherefore then should thy servant be yet a burden unto my lord the king?" Solomon was also a patron of the art, saying, "I gat me men singers and women singers, and the delights of the sons of men, as musical instruments, and that of all sorts." He was also a prolific composer, for "his songs were a thousand and five." The general conclusion from Ezra ii, 65, where he says, "There were among them two hundred singing men and singing women," seems to be that there was an equal number of each, and that they sang alternately. These singers formed a distinguished class, and were given maintenance. "It was the king's commandment concerning them, that a certain portion should be for the singers, due for every day." Cities were also assigned to them, for we read that "the priests and the Levites, . . . and the singers, . . . dwelt in their cities." We are given no information on the methods of teaching music among the Hebrews, but our biblical type of music master is Chenaniah, chief of the Levites, who "was for song" and "instructed about the song, because he was skillful."

The following table from Nelson's Bible illustrates in a clear and forceful manner the temple service of praise:

<i>Performers.</i>	<i>Instruments.</i>	<i>Function.</i>
Priests.....	Trumpet and Cornet....	Processions and feasts.
Orchestra of Levites }	{ Psaltery (Lyre or Lute) ..	Treble.
	{ Harp (or Viol)	Bass.
	{ Flute	Occasional use.
	{ Cymbals	To keep time.
Choir.....	{ Levites }	{ Ordinary and antiph- onal singing.
	{ Boys... }	
	{ Women }	
Congregation.....		Amens and responses.

In the second temple a platform was occupied by an orchestra of at least twelve instruments—nine harps, two psalteries, and one cymbal. Occasionally the organ (flute) was added.

Conclusion.—The ancient Hebrews never succeeded in raising music to the standard of a real art, and, in view of the universal use they made of it, it is remarkable that there was so little development of it. Their musical instruments were

practically the same in A. D. 70, when the Romans sacked the great temple at Jerusalem, as they were in the days of Jubal. The little triangular harp of Jubal's time, the *kinnor*, suffered some change and had had several strings added. Its companion instrument, the shepherd's pipe, had developed into several subvarieties, and trumpets had been brought into use. This was the sum total of development in about fifteen hundred years.* The early music of the Hebrews is of little practical moment to this generation, but its historical interest is great. They knew and appreciated the great value of music as an expression of emotion, and in joy or sorrow tuned their hearts to a song. In their beautiful temple services they truly worshiped in "the beauty of holiness."

As for the times of the New Testament, music was then of much less moment to the Hebrews than formerly, and hence the references to musical instruments are somewhat meager and of slight interest. Even when the subject is mentioned, the allusion is not specifically to music, as "the last trump." The language of the New Testament is of course not that of the Old, and in mentioning musical instruments and kindred subjects perhaps it was not possible to find an exact Greek equivalent for the Hebrew, while the music and instruments of Palestine must have been modified by later developments in the art. At all events Hebrew music had become too cosmopolitan to afford much present interest as a special study.

* It is of interest to note that many of the master minds in music have since been of the Hebrew race.

H. G. Simpson

ART. III.—THE TWENTIETH CENTURY PREACHER.

THE ideal preacher has been realized but once in history, and, should he appear now, would not be recognized as the man of the hour. As before, he would be "despised and rejected of men." Our purpose is simply to name a few of the distinctive features of the Gospel preacher which the nineteenth century has produced and projected into the twentieth. Nor do we mean to assert that this product is common. Every century has its anachronisms. Ghosts of the past haunt the present, and are trying to scare us into the belief that the rejuvenescence of the future can be secured only by lying in the skeleton embrace of death. Antiquated systems frequent a new age like withered hags, clad in decaying garments dripping with mold and emitting the odor of the sepulcher. The mediæval priest crosses the threshold of 1901 counting his beads, reciting his *Pater Nosters* and his *Ave Marias*, and kissing his holy relics. Scribes and Pharisees of every age come enforcing their dogmatic and ecclesiastic narrowness as the ancient truth of God and the only hope of the future. Antediluvians are here with the spirit of Cain, worshipping nature and endeavoring to recover their lost Eden by their own works. The odor of antiquity is easily mistaken for the incense of the sanctuary, and there are multitudes who fear that in turning from the past they are turning from God. The new man, the minister of the hour is a lonely soul, and can in some measure understand the profound pathos which is found in our Saviour's utterance, "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me."

A distinctive feature of the twentieth century preacher is a mind released from the thralldom of dogmatical and ecclesiastical authority. The last century has witnessed a remarkable reaction on the popular heart from the lifeless forms in which religious thought had congealed. The Augustinian theology which had dominated the greater part of Protestantism had lost its vitality. Mighty as it once was—as when it hurled "the

sovereignty of God" against the pretensions of the papacy and thus secured liberty of conscience for the individual; and, again, when under the massive genius of Edwards it swept like a rushing wind over the heart of New England—it had during the last century fossilized into a rigid system of logic, incrustated with endless definitions and exhausting polemics. Quite as dead was Arminianism in the English Church before the Wesleyan revival. It is thought by some of our best students that this form of theology was a political expedient adopted in England to differentiate the Anglican Church from the rest of Protestantism and yet not identify it with popery. The elements of truth that lay in the system could not have saved it, unless it had been disengaged from the political and sacerdotal fungi that were eating out its life.

The Oxford movement, which originally sought to recover a dying Church by a return to the sacerdotalism of Rome, was like an attempt to appease hunger with shells from which the meat had been taken. The form of religious thought—if, indeed, it can be called a form of thought—which has been so singularly fatal to the life of nations, and so feeble in the elevation of communities could not be commonly received as the bread of life. In England the reaction soon came, and its force was soon spent. Dr. Watkinson says that in many of the Romanizing churches the attendance is small, and when such churches are popular the congregations have little or no sympathy with the ideas which find expression in novel gestures and symbolism, and the innovation is endured with more or less impatience. From dead and deadening theologies the heart was sure to revolt. The prophets and conservators of this revolt were of widely diverse characters. On the one hand were men like Martineau, Maurice, Emerson, Channing, Romaine—great hearts who preferred to cross the circle of prescribed opinions and brave the perils of the outlying infinite, rather than to choke in an atmosphere thick with the dust of ages. On the other hand were men like Wesley, Bushnell, Brooks, Moody, Booth, Bruce, who believed the life could be found within that circle, if they would only go back far enough toward the center, where they would find in conscious experience the great truth which reason failed to prove.

Thus, both from within and from without the orthodox circle there has arisen a distrust of all human interpretations of divine truth.

This distrust has furthermore been strengthened by the trend of events in politics and commerce which have trampled under foot ancient traditions and have moved steadily on in the very face of priestly anathemas. The martyred heretics have proven to be the world's light bearers. The most efficient evangelists have been those who were the least encumbered with metaphysical and theological systems. The most sublime characters—sages, seers, and saints—have spoken out of the most opposing schools of thought. The area of divine truth is too great for any individual to cover. The quarrels of the ages over conflicting systems have led us to suspect that we have overlooked the full significance of the commandment, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." It is a remarkable fact that while Rome seeks to save her life by affirming her infallibility Calvinism would save hers by either burying or modifying her confession. One effort is as vain as the other; for religion is not a creed but a life—a life infinite in its adaptations to every people and to every century, varied and changing in its forms according to the material and the conditions on which it works.

Theology is not Christianity, but only a form of thinking it. If it be no more than a correct form of thought, although the river of life pours into it, it is a Dead Sea in which no living thing swims. On the other hand, the true life often thrives in a wrong theological system. It is this conviction that has liberated the twentieth century preacher from the thralldom of traditional theology. We do not say that scientific theology is doomed in the world. The closing years of the nineteenth century have not witnessed, as Comte prophesied, "the utter extinction of theology and the enthronement of the *Grand Être*." On the contrary, these years have proven to be a period of the reconstruction of theology. Its changing form does not mean decay, but unfolding life. But the very fact that it is changing proves that it is not yet perfect. Science is systematized knowledge; and, before theological or any other science is complete, it must not only have all the facts, but

must know those facts in all their causes and consequences. In short, it must be omniscient. This fact alone releases the mind of the preacher from slavish faith in the divinity of any form. Nevertheless, for us to affirm that he has no form of theology at all would be for us to deny his intelligence. Every active mind demands some intellectual shaping of the great facts of spiritual life. Nor can it rest while these facts lie in chaotic disorder. They must be systematized. But the preacher's system is not his final appeal. To make it so would be for him to claim to have exhausted the infinite, and to do for the living truth what the Pharisees did for the living Mosaism, who made their temple the sepulcher of their faith.

Another trend of the religious thought of the last fifty years which has given distinctive character to the preacher of the twentieth century is that faith should rest on historic fact, rather than on speculative theory. Hostile thinkers were alarming the Church by appealing to history. Our preachers were charged with preaching what was essentially the Gospel according to Paul, and misnaming their Paulianity Christianity. Renan said that the real danger to Christianity was not metaphysics but history. It was there that Strauss and others pitched their camp and set their guns. It was a fortunate alarm, for it led to a reexamination of the historic foundations of our faith. An appeal came to us like the voice of a prophet, "Back to Christ." There has never been a time since the apostolic age when Christ has been so earnestly and so universally studied as during the last half century. Never have so many and so able historians written the story of his life. It has been repeatedly told in the form of fiction, and poets have put it in rhythmical verse. Popular monthly magazines and weekly journals have told the old story in thoughtful and systematic order. This new study came like a fresh descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Church, and has given character to the age. It has been happily called "Johannine," which describes a more intuitive perception of the glory of Christ and a greater simplicity and depth of Christian thought and experience than characterized the Pauline or the Petrine era.

The preacher who is awake to the time has come to believe

that the one thing essential to the salvation of the century is the "Me and my words" of the gospels. He preaches Jesus—not the scholastic and the ecclesiastic caricature which has been too often thrust upon the consciences of the people and is as unlike the real Redeemer as is the painted effigy over the altar of a Romish church, but the historical Christ, his character, his work, and words. Everything, whether of thought-activity or morals, is brought to this final test for consideration and settlement. There is perhaps nothing that will explain the many excellencies of the distinctively twentieth century preacher as these two words, "Jesus only." Here lies the secret of the vitality of his ministry. It is intensely personal. The preacher believes that he is not merely to preach about Jesus, but to preach Jesus. His chief mission is not merely to present a great salvation, but a great Saviour. He cannot safely separate the thing he teaches from the Teacher. We do not question the fact that what Jesus taught is true even when separated from him. But it is truth in the abstract, beautiful as a statue and as cold and lifeless. To give a single illustration, Jesus once said, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." We all assent to it; but whose life does it influence? We go on in the old way, every man selfishly trying to save his life. It is a practical untruth. But in Jesus that truth becomes a living verity. We see him welcoming poverty, not because poverty is good, but because he would enrich the poor. We see him shortly after his transfiguration, when he might have ascended up on high, "steadfastly" setting his face "to go to Jerusalem," choosing to die that others might live. From the struggle of Gethsemane he goes calmly to the cross. Then it is that the truth incarnated glows with all the charm of life. Now, by his impersonation of it, it lives in the breast of millions who see that a life given to others is the highest life. And so of everything he taught. He embodies all in his own magnetic person. It is in the charmed circle of this personality that the preacher lives. And that calls out everything that is noble and joyful in him. It awakens slumbering endowments and brings them forth in rich thought and glad songs. It discovers to him his better self, and fills him not

only with a desire to be divine, but also with a conviction that he can be so and a determination that he will.

This vitalizing effect of a personal union with Jesus is furthered by the habitual study of his words, which the preacher believes he is called to preach. There is something in the words of Jesus which is not easy to explain, by virtue of which they flow into our lives like that river which, parting into four heads, went out of Eden to water the garden. The secret is not to be found merely in what he said, the words he spoke. Many of these in one form or another may be found hidden away in the old law or psalms or prophets or the comments of the great rabbis. Aye, some of the loftiest utterances of Jesus had been spoken by rare spirits outside of the recognized circle of faith, and centuries before he came. His mission was not to say new things, but true things. But, when he says them, they come like something new. They throb with the might of his own personality. They awaken slumbering divinity in us. Like the spirit, they "quicken." He himself explains the mystery, "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Augustine says that what Jesus meant when he spoke these words was that they were the statement of spiritual truths in distinction from historical and scientific truths. But there is certainly a larger meaning than that in this strong utterance. He makes his words not merely the carrier of spiritual truth, but they bear somewhat of the very spirit that created them: "My words are spirit. It is the spirit that giveth life." His words come to the receptive soul like the breath of the Creator in Adam's nostrils. They carry not simply the thoughts of the Redeemer, but they are the bearer of his own life which he communicates to us in his utterance and so re-creates himself anew in us.

Another very characteristic feature of the last half of the nineteenth century is a strong current of materialism which has poured through the age with disastrous results. Its flotsam and jetsam are secularization of piety, despair of faith, and wreck of morals. It arose chiefly out of the stupendous discoveries which science has made in the realm of nature and the still more stupendous application of those discoveries to practical uses. Never has the world witnessed such sudden

and enormous changes in its material wealth and consequent social conditions as those that have occurred during the present age. The extravagant fictions of the Arabian imagination are the sober realities of our day. Science has discovered the Aladdin lamp and how to command its genii. Obeying the first command, "Subdue the earth," it is rapidly fulfilling the divine purpose, "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet." The forces of nature have become our willing servants and are relieving us from the curse of slavish toil. The old image of our drudgery, "The shoulder to the wheel," has been changed to "Touch the button." How rich we are! The average man of to-day lives in the enjoyment of comforts of which the most luxurious princes of the centuries past did not even dream. Does he want gardens with fountains, lakes, and winding avenues? Here they are as free as the air he breathes. Does he want the breath of the hills? The chariot is at the door, drawn by the steeds of the sky. Does he want books? The library is free, his for the using. The elves of the air tell him the story of the world's yesterday while he eats his morning meal. The springs of the mountain pour their streams into his room. The lightning turns his night into day. The sun paints his pictures. The orchards, vineyards, pasture fields, and granaries of every nation lay their treasure on his table. Such is the opulence of our civilization. But material prosperity has its perils. Ascribing its progress to the intellect of man, its temptation is to deify reason and debase faith. It emphasizes the outward good, to the neglect of the inward; and earthly wealth is often the sod that lies on buried simplicity, purity, and joy. It creates a false measurement of personal worth, making success the gauge of a man. It lowers our ideals, discarding the old-fashioned notion that virtue is peerless and exalting the rich man as the noblest work of God. It carries its method into the house of the Lord. Organization passes for piety, bustling activity for holiness, generous giving for consecration, æsthetic ceremonial for worship. The pulpit becomes the platform for literary, scientific, and humorous lectures on "up-to-date themes." The kitchen, the parlor, the stage are features of the holy house.

The club invades the church. The result is a lamentable secularization of holy things, in which we fail to distinguish what is of the world and what is of God. Far be it from us to say that this has been the universal condition of things in the time of which we are writing. In some respects this age has been unparalleled in many centuries in the depth and breadth of its work for Christ. Yet there can be no question but that the nineteenth century has been troubled by the destructive sweep of a resistless cyclone of secularism.

The philosophical justification of the dominating secularization of life is materialism. Although it has been called a science, most of its tenets are hypothetical statements, rather than proven facts, and are utterly lacking in scientific classification. The inchoate cult is better called an intellectual drift. For this reason it is difficult to seize or resist. Like Laodamia, we may think we clasp a body,

But unsubstantial form eludes our grasp.

Its basis is the ancient atomic theory which reduces the universe, including God, to the atom and motion. Spirit, soul, life, character, love are only "a heap of dust." That godlike being we call man is resolved into physiological chemistry. The crucible and the microscope explain him. Life is only matter in motion—"aquosity." Soul is no more than a vibration of the cerebral nerve, a music which has no existence aside from the strings which evoked it. It differs from the animal, not in its kind but in the measure of its nerve forces. As the sun is the giver of all kinds of force—vital and nervous, as well as mechanical and chemical—the life of the soul is the sun. Thus this modern atomist builds anew the ruined altars of Assyria. O Baal! Ideas are changes in the gray matter of the brain, their clearness and force being proportioned to the quantity of phosphorus and other chemicals it contains. Pharmacy explains the scholar. That imperial thing we call the will is but a current of electricity. Moral character ceases to exist, and ethics is simply a question of voltaic batteries. Conscience is automatism, and character a chemical product. Religion is self-delusion. The only immortality, as Moleschott states it, is that "when the body is

disintegrated its ammonia, carbonic acid, and lime serve to enrich the earth and to nourish plants, which feed other generations of men." This, then, is the sum of this high imagination of modern secularism; out of the atom we came, chemistry is our career, and our destiny is compost.

From this withering atheistic materialism there has already come a powerful rebound. The pendulum is swinging over to the other extreme of idealism, which affirms that the unseen alone is reality and the seen is only its expression. Spirit is the cause, and matter is the effect. "Spirituality" is the word of the hour. How ready the age was for this new thought is seen in the eagerness with which the hungry heart turns to the many tables on which is supposed to be spread the "hidden manna." That weird *olla podrida* of oriental religion and occidental science known as "theosophy" has had an astounding growth, and that in spite of the exposed fraud of its great prophetess. Studies in the occult are not only fascinating the intellect, but are commanding the heart's devotion. There men are erecting their altars. The followers of spiritism are numbered by the million. "Metaphysical science" has become a Church, with a membership that is phenomenal in its rapid increase and in its sweet contentment. Books on the immanence of God, psychic phenomena, and the power of silence are of a high literary grade, and are having an enormous sale. Professors in our universities are making special studies in the psychology of spirituality.

The effect of all this on the preacher of the Gospel who is sensitive to the temper of the times is to convince him that he must live in conscious personal union with God. His life is the constant inhaling of that Spirit by which originally man became a living soul. No system of thought or order of worship or mode of behavior, however correct it may be, can be a substitute for the life of God in the soul of man. The subjective features of spirituality are not easily defined. The phenomena of life within the sphere of the soul seem to belong to that class of occult themes which do not come in the category of common thought. The word "life," even in its simplest and most obvious sense, has not yet been satisfactorily defined. How, then, can we unveil this Isis who sits

enthroned in the profound depths of our being? One thing, however, is sure—spiritual life is not to be identified with any particular form of emotionalism or intellectuality or moral behavior. It interpenetrates and gives character to them all, “bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.” Nor is it sufficiently accurate to say that it is a life like Christ’s which we attain by a laborious imitation of him. It is his very own imparted to us by his Spirit, as we impart our thought and feeling to others, enriching them without impoverishing ourselves. It is, first and chiefly, “Christ in us.”

There are three features of this inner life which our century is emphasizing. The first, which distinguishes it from the spirituality of the Mystics, is that it values this outer world as the expression of the immanent God and the sphere of the soul’s activity. Not in the caves of Thebais or the cells of the monastery, with their night-long vigils and wasting austerities, does the spirit of man find its divinest ideal, but where Christ found it—in the household, by the wayside, in the market place, in the scenes of recreation, or in the place of toil. The true preacher of the century is, in the right sense of the word, a man of the world, who becomes holy, not by giving up his horses, but by writing on their bridles, “Holiness unto the Lord.” Though his citizenship is in heaven he cannot separate himself from this world. He enters into its politics, its education, its benevolences, its social and business relations. But in doing so he contributes in his measure toward bringing down to earth the heavenly city, the New Jerusalem.

The second feature of his spiritual life is practical morality. A word commanding attention in these latter days is “ethics.” It expresses a healthful movement of religious thought. We prefer it to the more common word “morals,” because it is deeper and states more accurately the true relation of conduct to religion. The Latin word *mores*, “manners,” simply describes behavior. The Greek word is “character,” including conduct but tracking it back to its spring. It is suggestive of the Sermon on the Mount, which lays bare the fatal defect of conduct regulated solely by rule—incomplete, delusive, slavish. True morality has its root, its liberty, its perfection in religion.

Religion is not a mere gush of pious sentiment, but a rugged principle of truth and duty. It is life that issues in conduct. Indeed, it is the act that is the final test of character. But, while that is true, Jesus has very little to say about the details of conduct. He rarely tells us in the great moralities what we shall and what we shall not do. We have often wondered why he did not speak more definitely about the great abuses, such as drunkenness, slavery, dice and other games, or the immoralities of trade. Instead of that he gave us great life principles, leaving it to the individual conscience to make the application of them to the incidents and occasions of life as they might arise. To borrow an illustration, Christ's directions are not finger posts on the roadside, which are of service only in the place where they are set up, but rather a pocket compass which rightly used and understood will give a man his bearings everywhere and always. That is life.

And that is the third feature of spirituality which our century emphasizes—liberty. We are free, not to do wrong, for that would be enslavement indeed; but, by virtue of the inner life of holiness, we are free to do the thing we wish. As Dante was told by Virgil when about to enter Paradise,

Take thy pleasure for thy guide henceforth;

Free and upright and sound is thy free will,

And error were it not to do its bidding;

Thee o'er thyself I therefore crown and miter.

Another characteristic feature of the time which has given color and tone to the preaching of the century is brotherhood. It is by no means a new idea in the world. It was dreamed by the classics; but their most extravagant dreams were hardly a hint of what the close of the nineteenth century has realized. It was clearly taught by Jesus; but the limitations of the common thought made it possible for none but the noblest minds to accept it. It staggered even such men as Peter and James. Later, the idea was debauched by becoming the battle cry of passion. Fraternity was lost in communism. But the divine idea has been spoken and emphasized during the past hundred years as never before in history; and we believe that this century is to witness a wonderful

approach toward its realization. Many and varied have been the forces which have contributed to this end. The sciences have done much. If steam and electricity have not literally annihilated space, they have certainly compressed this world and brought its parts into closer touch. The traveler makes the tour of the world now as quickly and with greater comfort than he could have traveled from Boston to San Francisco one hundred years ago. And during his journey he can pause and converse with the dear ones at home. Geographically the nations are not wide asunder. The other country is simply my neighbor's garden. Physiology and anatomy demonstrate the identity of the human species. Ethnology affirms the essential unity of the race. Philology confirms it. More and more is science assenting to St. Paul's declaration that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." Amid a great variety of men, there is but one humanity. Commerce is another factor in affirming the kinship of man. However selfish it is at heart, and however conscienceless it often is in its methods, it has made it impossible for the nations to live in isolation. China is an instance in point. Commerce has proven to us how needful we are to each other. Our daily wants must needs be supplied by the gifts of all the lands. We cannot live apart. Another thing which serves this end is the spirit of exploration and colonization which possesses the heart of all the civilized nations. If it were the glory of the fifteenth century to discover continents, it is the glory of the nineteenth to explore and more fully occupy them. Livingstone, Speke, Schweinfurth, Stanley are names of our time. The ambition of nations is no longer to unfold their individual life within the limits of their own territory. Their outlook is world-wide, and expansion is their law. Many of us believe that we are in the dawn of the day which is to realize the confederation of the nations. Literature has been another factor contributing to the growth of the passion of brotherhood. All the great poems, dramas, romances breathe a spirit that is cosmopolitan. Goethe, Shakespeare, Dante, Molière, Balzac, Camoëns, Longfellow, and all the goodly company which held the pen of genius belong not alone to a nation but

to the world. In the literary Pantheon the Immortals are from every clime. The modern study of the religions of the world, wide apart as they are, also emphasizes the absolute oneness of man in his spiritual being. Everywhere he has the same sense of sin and guilt, the same premonition of penalty, the same feeling that relief is obtained only by sacrifice, the same aspiration for the divine. Wherever the Gospel of Christ has been received, it works the same sublime regeneration and holiness of heart and life as among us who have come into it by generations of culture.

The effect of all this on the preacher is to fill him with the missionary spirit. "Wise men who know the time" have learned that the very law of the Churches' life is service. The luxury of selfishness is a deadly disease like a cancerous growth, which, while it enlarges, is eating out the very life both of the individual and the community. The luxurious minister—"up-to-date" as he believes himself to be—is only the deserted shell of the chrysalis. His venerable traditions, his splendid ritual, his dignified conventions are an empty sepulcher; and the only real service we can hope from him is that he will soon give his carcass to fill it. This is not an age for the expenditure of our strength in erecting pyramids or cathedrals, but in founding libraries, schools, hospitals, asylums, dispensaries, missions, which will help a struggling people out of their poverty, ignorance, vice, and misery into that divine manhood which is their birthright. This is the temper of the time, and he is the true preacher of the age whose heart is most in tune with this spirit. Browning strikes its keynote when he says:

The man most man, with tenderest hands,
Works best for men, as God in Nazareth.

In closing our study of the preacher who enters this century, we cannot refrain from some denominational pride that the Methodist Episcopal Church has inherited or acquired so little to prevent our preachers from answering the highest demand of the modern world. We are not encumbered with an antiquated doctrinal system. The tenets of our faith are preached in every evangelical pulpit, and require no labored adaptation to the culture of the age. While we have an elab-

orate organism our genius is against the idolatry of any ecclesiastical form which would prevent the adjustment of our administration to every fresh requirement. Our Church originated in a hunger of soul for a genuine spiritual life ; nor has it forgotten the dream of its youth. Its ideal of holiness has become the aspiration of multitudes of leading spirits outside of the sphere of the denomination. It has from the first been a Church of the people and for the people. In exceptional instances where it has attempted to pamper to a class it has had a precarious existence and found itself out of harmony with its environment. It has always been missionary, both in spirit and practice. Its very soul is evangelism, and it believes the *dictum* of its founder, "The world is my parish." Truly, the Methodist preacher who aspires to meet the requirement of the age need seek no more favorable environment than that of his own denomination.

A. H. Tuttle.

ART. IV.—AN INDICTMENT AGAINST MORMONISM.

THE Mormon hierarchy was never more thoroughly united and determined than now. The term "hierarchy" is used advisedly, as will be manifest in this article. The Mormons call themselves a "Church," but they are not such in the true signification of that term. In opposing them we are not antagonizing a Church, but rather a socio-political propaganda of the most virulent and vicious type.* Multitudes of people throughout the East believed that with the entering of Utah into the sisterhood of States the offensive features of the system under review would pass away and be heard of no more. Those who were acquainted with the system by actual contact therewith felt morally certain, and did not hesitate to declare, that there was no real intention to give up any essential feature or abate one iota of zeal for its propagation. In the light of the most careful and thorough observation on the field during the past three years we unhesitatingly affirm that never before have the Mormons been so eager and determined as now in pushing their work, not merely in the far West, but in the South and East.

The influence of the Mormon hierarchy upon legislation is second only to that of the Roman hierarchy. Instead of being "a case out of court" Mormonism is one of the burning questions before both Church and State in these opening days of the twentieth century. That our readers may know more of this iniquity we present the following indictment :

First : The system had its origin in deceit and fraud. Engaged in digging a well near Palmyra, New York, in September, 1819, were Joseph Smith, Sr., and his two older boys. Loitering about in company with other idlers was Joseph Smith, Jr. The family was destitute of good name, but young Joseph was remarkable for shrewd cunning, and had won a large following among the clans. On this occasion he picked up a peculiarly shaped stone and carried it away to his wretched

* The writer knows whereof he speaks, for it was his privilege to spend two years in educational work that brought him into frequent contact with the various phases of Mormonism before Utah became a State ; and his present position places him in the city which is now, and has for several years been, the chief center from which are sent out missionaries all through the vast Southland.

home with an air of great mystery. He professed to see marvelous sights by looking through this stone. The others were greatly excited. Soon he began to see great chests and kettles of gold hidden away in the earth. Men ridiculed him at first; but he persisted until men and money were forthcoming to carry on the digging. One of the conditions revealed to him by an angel was, that no one should speak during the digging. Thus early did this "first prophet of Mormonism" have "special revelations" direct from God.

Notwithstanding the failure of seven or eight years of intermittent effort in unearthing these hidden treasures—some mishap always destroying the charm when they were just on the point of grasping them—dupes were plentiful, and the fame of these "diggings" became more than local. But this could not last always. Some new tack was necessary. During the summer of 1827 a stranger came often to Smith's house, and seemed very intimate with Joseph. At about this time the younger Smith also professed to have a wonderful vision. The angel of the Lord appeared to him, while engaged in secret prayer in the woods, and proclaimed to him that all the Churches were in error, but that to him should be revealed the true "way of life." Then there came another angel revealing to him the astonishing fact that he was to be the instrument of the "new revelation." These visions continued until he was finally commanded to go alone at a secretly fixed hour of an appointed day to a certain spot and dig out of the earth a metallic book of great antiquity and of lasting consequence to men, it being nothing less than a record in mystic letters of the long-lost tribes of Israel, which no human being but himself could see and live. To him also was given power to translate this wonderful book, which should become a supplementary Bible, or "God's newer revelation to men." At the time designated in the revelation Smith started off with every appearance of solemnity, and after some three or four hours came back with something closely wrapped in a large cloth. The tales he told about the miraculous occurrences while engaged alone in the digging rivaled anything his most superstitious listeners had ever heard. "Legions of devils," he declared, "disputed every inch of ground."

The query very naturally arises as to whence came the so-called "Book of Mormon," which was afterward published and which purports to be a translation of the golden Bible found in the hill near Smith's house. It possesses a large degree of literary merit, and entirely surpasses the powers of so illiterate a man as the pretended prophet. Taking into account the circumstances connected with the coming of the stranger to Smith's house, just previous to his wonderful "change of visions" from seeing gold to seeing a new Bible, and correlating them with other facts which it is needless to relate, the conclusion is almost inevitable that young Smith purchased from the stranger a stolen manuscript and concocted the scheme of "*finding*" the mysterious metallic book and by supernatural aid translating it. He worked faithfully many long and weary weeks, hidden away alone, translating the strange "divinely illumined" letters. When at last the translation was complete, namely, when Smith had copied such portions of the purchased manuscript as suited his purpose, and filled in such other matter as completed what he wanted to foist upon the people, dupes were found ready to accept it as divine and money was freely subscribed to publish it. As will be seen from these well-authenticated facts of history, Mormonism was conceived in deceit, born in fraud, and cradled in imposture.

Second : The first twenty years of the history of the Mormons is one of cumulative meanness and social ostracism. The reader need not long delay upon this proposition. Soon after the publication of the new and wonderful book the better class of people became disgusted with Smith's pretensions to supernatural power and threatened to see for themselves the marvelous metallic book, whereat he fled into Ontario County. There the professors of the new faith prospered for a little time; but in less than a year they became obnoxious to fair-minded men and were constrained to depart for Ohio. Mormon missionaries were sent out, full of zeal for the cause, "indued with power to speak in unknown tongues, exercise the gift of prophecy, heal the sick, and perform all manner of miracles." The same hard fate attended them in Ohio, by reason of their iniquitous practices, and in about a year Smith had a remarkable

revelation from the gods directing them to go to Missouri. There, in 1832, *The Evening and Morning Star* was established and began spreading Mormon doctrines broadcast throughout the entire region. The people became so exasperated that on July 20, 1833, they resolved upon the expulsion of the Mormons from their midst. They demanded that the *Star* office be at once closed, and that the Mormons immediately leave. The saints demurred, but the people demolished the printing office, and gave two of the leading Mormons a coat of tar and feathers. Some fled across the Missouri and some returned to Kirtland, Ohio. Here, in 1835, the first quorum of twelve apostles was ordained, one of whom was Brigham Young. The occurrence of greatest moment, however, was the finishing of the temple in March, 1836. It was constructed at a cost of forty thousand dollars, the amount being an immense outlay for one building in that day and region. The money was extorted from the faithful in various ways—largely by appealing to their love for the dead. Smith taught that it was necessary to salvation to be baptized in a Mormon temple, but that the living could be baptized for the dead. Of course they were anxious to remove their dead relatives from purgatory as soon as possible, so that willing hands hastened the work by voluntary toil and money came freely.

What was known as "The Danite Band," or the "United Brothers of Gideon," was formed and placed under the leadership of one of the apostles. This incipient army, it was confidently predicted, would one day subjugate the whole earth. They, however, possessed more the character of marauders and assassins than of good soldiers. The region was infested with burglars, and murders became exceedingly common. These "Danites" have been one of the chief instruments, during all subsequent years, for visiting sure and swift destruction upon those of their own number seeming liable to apostatize, and upon troublesome Gentiles. About this time Smith received a most wonderful revelation direct from heaven enjoining polygamy. Only the apostles and foremost elders were at first informed of this supreme revelation. It will thus be seen that although the popular thought of to-day regards Mormonism and polygamy as almost synonymous terms,

this was by no means the root whence Mormonism sprang, but an aftergrowth, having its germ in the licentious character of the founder. Soon the opposition proved too great in that region for the leaders, and a convenient revelation directed them to Nauvoo, Illinois. There their record is even darker. Smith and his brother were finally shot by the mob in the Carthage jail, whither they had been taken for safety. The twelve apostles being now supreme, a quarrel arose between the foremost two, Brigham Young and Sidney Rigdon, as to who should be president. Young proved more than a match for Rigdon, and on being recognized as the spiritual and temporal head of the Church cut off all dissenters and "delivered them over to the devil to be buffeted for a thousand years." In September, 1849, they had become established in Utah, and President Fillmore signed a bill organizing Utah Territory. Brigham Young was made governor. From that time to the present they have gone on increasing not only in numbers but in iniquity, whose stench has reached the nostrils of all the civilized peoples of the earth.

Third: Their peculiar social customs are not only so revolting as to forbid detailed description, but are rooted in their fundamental doctrines. None but those who have actually resided in those regions, coming into constant contact with the influences of their "peculiar system" and into frequent business or professional relations with it, can understand Mormonism. Let the reader be again reminded that this article speaks from personal observation. Those who visit Salt Lake City or any of the larger centers see Mormonism in company dress. Neither time nor expense is spared in case their leaders think a good impression can be made upon a representative man from the East. All the evil features are kept under cover. Their publishing houses and popular publications are freely shown, but not their secret books of doctrine. Their great houses, fitted up in superb style, having every convenience and luxury of the genuine Christian home, are thrown open with lavish hospitality. The most tactful efforts are constantly made to convince visitors that their domestic system is the sweetest and most harmonious ever known. But to see the typical Mormon habitation one must go into the smaller

towns where there are few Gentiles. There one often finds families of from two to five wives and dozens of children crowded into two or three large rooms and a loft. To even think of such herding of human beings under the sacred name of "home" is to outrage all the better instincts of our natures; to describe it fully no writer will dare.

We know no better way to let in the sunlight of truth without offense than to state a few of the fundamental doctrines of Mormonism on this subject and let the reader infer the inevitable results in actual life. No Mormon missionaries ever divulge these doctrines. They never show their sacred books when one is visiting their publishing houses. They will stoutly declare that there are no such doctrines. They are taught that to lie to a Gentile when it will help Zion is praiseworthy, and that when a Gentile tells an unwholesome truth concerning their system it will greatly aid the faithful Mormon to win celestial glory if he declares the Gentile a liar. The writer has frequently encountered their missionaries and heard them brazenly assert that he lied, when he has stated that they held such doctrines as those presented here and subsequently. But this is what we might expect from men who have been chosen for the "high and holy calling of a missionary" because of their zeal for the Church and evident faith in her doctrines including "no faith with Gentiles," as above declared. They lay down the following as three fundamental tenets: (*a*) There are a great many gods; (*b*) All the gods are polygamists; (*c*) The head of every polygamous family will in eternity come to be a god and have a celestial kingdom, the extent and glory of which will be proportionate to the number of his wives and children. Let the reader carefully note the sequence of these doctrines and draw his own conclusions as to why polygamy cannot be eradicated from this monstrous system. The children are thoroughly indoctrinated, while the proselytes from other regions are generally uneducated and readily accept the teaching of zealous catechists. Moreover, when going through the endowment house, or, in other words, being initiated into Mormonism, they are sworn to obey the priesthood in every least particular.

The orthodox Mormon fully believes that Jesus had several

wives and that he himself cannot be Christlike unless he has several. They teach that every saint who is commanded to enter into polygamy by the priesthood and refuses will be eternally damned. Many a man who loves the wife of his youth with sacred loyalty and would sacrifice every earthly consideration rather than violate the holy bond by taking another does so because not to enter into polygamy is to lose heaven. Having once launched upon the slimy sea, he is prone to take on all possible sail, to the end that his celestial glory may be very great. Thousands of faithful wives who would gladly endure every conceivable physical torture, rather than have another wife brought into the house, patiently submit in order to make sure of entering heaven, and incidentally in order that their husbands may shine as resplendent as others in the new Jerusalem.

It is almost impossible to comprehend the absoluteness of the power such a belief exerts over multitudes and how completely, together with other tenets, it holds them soul and body in a bondage of nameless misery. The following are two extracts from their authoritative deliverances: "When I trifle with the priesthood I trifle with the Almighty. I forfeit my salvation and every blessing I possess." "To me the word comes as the word of the Lord. He will come in flames of fire and will take vengeance on them that know not God and do not obey his priesthood and the power he has placed on earth."

As before indicated, it is not our purpose to say much about polygamy, but to leave the reader to draw his own conclusions. Nearly every writer and speaker dwells upon this feature of the system. So generally is this course pursued that most people have been led to think that this is about the only crime which the Mormon system fosters. But nothing could come farther short of the truth. The worst that has ever been written concerning polygamy has utterly failed to describe it as seen in practice in the smaller towns and country regions, not only in Utah but other sections; and yet lust is only one item in this bill of indictment.

Fourth: The Mormon system of extortion is more galling in many respects than that of the worst governed countries of

Europe during the Middle Ages. In those countries the rank and file were robbed under the semblance of civil law enforced by open violence. Under this system they are robbed by the hierarchy, whose mandates are enforced by secret violence and threats more terrible to the faithful than death or physical torture. By this practice of extortion the coffers of the propaganda are kept full, and at any time the president can command all the money needed to influence legislation, send out missionaries, pay the traveling expenses of the thousands they gather from the far-away East and South and even Europe, and do anything else that the interests of Mormonism demand. We are not now speaking of the "tenth," about which so much is written. They do not stop with a tenth. They often demand a fifth or a third, and woe unto the Mormon who fails to meet every demand. Sometimes by a special revelation from heaven "two thirds" is named as the Lord's share, and it must be forthcoming on pain of death.

The reader doubtless queries as to how the leaders can find out every man's income. We reply that not only is this known to the priesthood, but all his affairs besides, provided they are of sufficient importance to call for reporting. Their system of espionage is equal to, and in many particulars surpasses, that of the Jesuits in the darkest days of the Inquisition. This is a grave charge to make concerning a class of people in free America, but it is the literal truth. How do they do it? As follows: Here is a Mormon city, large or small as the case may be. It is divided unto wards, every ward is divided into districts, and over every district is placed a "teacher" so called. He is chosen on account of his faithfulness to Zion and his special fitness for the work. He is not a teacher in any true sense of the word, but a spy. He is not merely privileged but commissioned to know all the secrets of every household and of every person's affairs in his district. All the district teachers in a ward report to the ward bishop. All ward bishops report to the central bishop, who is very apt to be the mayor. Wherever Mormon majorities are sufficiently overwhelming this system is worked vigorously. Where Gentiles are numerous it is worked as fully as possible, and to the extent of their power they watch the Gentile

families also. Every teacher acts as a spur to every other one. Favoritism or negligence is next to impossible. Even zealous private individuals act as a guard upon their teachers. If any teacher fails to bring any member to book he may be degraded to the ranks, and some eager informant put in his place. Let the reader take note. This system cannot be fully and openly carried out where Gentiles are numerous. Moreover, Mormon missionaries and leaders of all grades will declare on oath that no such espionage exists anywhere. The reader is also reminded that these same leaders have solemnly sworn to uphold the priesthood in everything, and that they believe a lie either to or about a Gentile is honorable, and a help toward heaven, if the falsehood is calculated to benefit the Church.

Suppose, now, some man gets an advance in wages from a dollar to a dollar and a half per day, but continues to pay in only ten cents per day. The teacher will soon find it out and report him. He will be "warned," and perhaps a heavy money "penance" be exacted. Some wife becomes dissatisfied because her husband is planning to take another. He has been unable to convince her that the interests of his "celestial kingdom" demand the additional spiritual wife, and so he appeals to the teacher. She is warned, and if still incorrigible is reported to the ward bishop, who visits her; and if the case is one which lighter threats will not cure, she is reminded of the doctrine of blood-atonement through the operation of which her life will be taken if she persists in her opposition. In many instances such have persisted, and have been "missing;" but generally this awful threat conquers. Some poor proselyte who has listened to the smooth tales of a missionary and has come on from the East or South filled with the hope of better pay for labor and greater opportunities for advancement, assured that none of the peculiar exactions reported against the system by the "wicked Gentiles" will be put upon them, has awakened to the wretched reality and wants to get away. Her discontent becomes known to the teacher. Warning is given. Escape is almost impossible. The writer has had some bitter personal experiences in endeavoring to rescue such sufferers from an unforeseen bon-

dage worse than death. What mediæval despotism could equal this ingenious system?

Fifth: Mormonism teaches treason against the United States government. The following is the verbatim testimony given by one who had escaped from the Mormons concerning one of the oaths administered during the endowment house ceremonies:

We were therefore sworn to cherish constant enmity toward the United States government, to do all that we could toward destroying, tearing down, or overturning that government, to renounce all allegiance, and refuse all submission. If unable to do anything ourselves toward the accomplishment of these objects, to teach it to our children from the nursery, impress it upon them from the deathbed, entail it upon them as a legacy. To make it the one leading idea and sacred duty of their lives, so that the kingdom of God and his Christ, the Mormon Church and its priesthood, might subdue all other kingdoms and fill the whole earth. Curses the most frightful and penalties the most barbarous were threatened on nonfulfillment.

Any man who has been much among the Mormons knows that from infancy their families are carefully trained in accordance with these teachings. Moreover, wherever Gentile influence does not prevent, their preachers most persistently inculcate these doctrines. The following is an utterance taken down as it was spoken by one of their foremost priests:

God is greater than the United States, and when the government conflicts with him we will be ranged under the banner of heaven and against the government. The United States says we cannot marry more than one wife; God says different. We had no hand in the business. It was all the work of God, and his laws must be obeyed. If the United States says different, the saints cannot obey it. We do not want to rebel against the United States. Rebellion is not on the programme; but we will worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences. We want to be friendly with the United States, if the government will let us, but not a jot or a tittle of our rights will be given up to purchase it. Polygamy is a divine institution. It has been handed down direct from God. The United States cannot abolish it. No nation on earth can prevent it, nor all the nations of the earth combined.

And yet men of sturdy common sense seem to have been caught by their pretense of doing away with polygamy. Credulity gone daft! The only way to account for it is to

assume that those thus deceived have not known how thoroughly this doctrine is wrought into the very fiber of the orthodox Mormon's being. Of course they would profess to do away with it; and because it would give them a better chance to break away from all federal authority at a period later on, they would lay aside the open practice of polygamy for the present and win celestial favor by perjuring themselves for the good of Zion.

Treason is proven, but let us look again. "The kingdom of God is an order of government established by divine authority. It is the only legal government that can exist in any part of the universe. All other governments are illegal and unauthorized. Any people attempting to govern themselves by laws of their own making, and by officers of their own appointing, are in direct rebellion against the kingdom of God." This is the very essence of treason, the very core of nullification. Within the memory of most of us blood and treasure beyond all price were freely laid upon the altar of the Union. Have we so soon forgotten? Have we given the sovereign powers of statehood to a territory which is dominated by self-confessed traitors? This lust of power seems even more all-consuming among the leaders, the older hierarchy, than does the lust of the flesh.

Sixth: The Mormon hierarchy are systematic murderers, in the name of their gods and for the good of their so-called "Church." For many years it was a great mystery what became of so many of the proselytes who were known to have become dissatisfied after entering Mormondom, but of whom nothing further could ever be learned, either by old friends East or searchers on the ground. The same mystery hung about the disappearance of numerous Gentiles, who were known to have entered those regions, but from which they never emerged. In other instances they were known to have been murdered. It was no very uncommon occurrence at that time for some person to be found dead in an alley or out among the sagebrush. It was an exceedingly uncommon occurrence for even a suspect to be arrested. Many times we Gentiles were morally certain that the Mormon leaders knew all about who did the bloody work, but we were powerless

where the mayor, aldermen, policemen, and, in fact, nearly all officers were Mormons. Such murders are seldom ever heard of by the outside world. The mystery was, however, dispelled when it was discovered that one of the sacred doctrines of Mormonism is that of blood-atonement, whereby this horrible practice of murder is provided for. We quote enough of it to show the reader what it is:

There are sins that can be atoned for by an offering as in ancient days, and there are sins that must be atoned for by the blood of man. All mankind love themselves, and let those principles be known by an individual and he would be glad to have his blood shed. This would be loving ourselves unto an eternal exaltation. Will you love your brothers or sisters likewise, when they have a sin that cannot be atoned for without the shedding of their blood? That is what Jesus meant. That is the way to love mankind. This is loving our neighbor as ourselves. If he needs help, help him. If he wishes salvation, and it is necessary to spill his blood upon the ground in order that he be saved, spill it. . . . Did not Moses kill an Egyptian and put him under the sand, and have not we, the only people of God, just as good a right to kill a Babylonian and put him under the sod if the interests of Zion demand it?

Now with these teachings before him, let the reader call to mind the system of espionage above detailed, and he may be able to form some conception of the power of the Mormon hierarchy over both the persons and property of their subjects. He will also see how easily any obnoxious Gentile can be gotten out of the way. Let the mayor of the city or the president of the village be a Mormon priest, as is very commonly the case, and let the aldermen or the members of the village board be leading preachers, as they are almost certain to be in the smaller towns. Under these conditions the policemen or constables or sheriffs are sure to be true and tried Mormons. A teacher has given warning to some dissatisfied wife, but she has not heeded the admonition. The ward bishop has visited her, but still she gives signs of apostatizing. A council is held, and it is decided that she shall be blood-atoned, in order to save her soul. If there are but few Gentiles in the town or city, not much secrecy is observed. Almost any man may be commissioned to do the deed. But, if Gentiles are numerous, some Danite, policeman, or constable is

detailed to shed her blood. In due time it is done. There is no escape. From highest official to sacred executioner every man has done his sworn duty. The blood of the slain is upon all of them, but such blood only makes illustrious crowns and extensive dominion in the New Jerusalem more certain for the perpetrators. A Gentile is thought to be undermining the faith of his Mormon neighbors or in some way to be inimical to Zion. As before stated, the teacher who has charge of the district within which he resides has an eye upon him. Report is made. A more careful watch is instituted. If suspicions are confirmed, the same proceedings are entered into as in the former case, only much more cautiously, and in process of time that Gentile "bites the dust." His death is shrouded in the darkest mystery, and if any trouble is feared from the Gentiles large rewards are offered by the Mormons for the arrest and conviction of the murderer. As a matter of course he is never found.

These are not supposititious cases. Hundreds of such murders—"legalized killings"—have occurred. We mean just that. By actual count hundreds of them, where the neighbors or friends were entirely convinced that they were committed in the name of one of Mormonism's most sacred doctrines. But to undertake to prove it would be to jeopardize their own lives, while even if the most absolute proof could be furnished no jury could be found to convict. We might give numerous instances of the working of this bloody doctrine, from the waylaying of an innocent prospector, who seemed likely to encroach upon the claims of the saints, to that of one of the most beautiful wives of a leading missionary who had shown signs of insubordination during his absence; for any man who lives among the Mormons, and keeps eyes and ears open, will come to know that they visit these judgments upon all classes, as the interests of the system seem to demand. But we turn with horror from even the contemplation of such sickening crimes, feeling that every count in our indictment against Mormonism has been fully sustained.

G. E. Ackerman

ART. V.—MISCELLANEOUS PROTESTANT BLUNDERS.

THIS paper, as its name implies, is meant to be a hodge-podge. We have already dealt with the central Protestant error respecting the Church of Rome, namely, that the pope is supposed capable, by his mere arbitrary act, not only of putting a man out of the Church, but, by this mere fact, out of a state of salvation. This error perhaps turns the whole Roman Catholic system of doctrine more thoroughly topsy-turvy than any other, as it is almost the worst of all in its influence on Protestant feeling. There is left, however, an infinity of prevalent blunders.

Roman Catholic theology is so vast and so widely ramified a system that—distinct as are its great lines and forming principles—it is hardly within mortal power to master it wholly. A learned divine, to whom the writer once remarked that, so far as he could see, almost no one could draw the line with perfect certainty in his Church between dogma and opinion, laughingly rejoined, "You might have left out the 'almost.'" It is really amusing to see with what calm confidence writers of opposite schools will say of some proposition, "This is of faith," when other men of equal learning and standing will declare it to be mere opinion, and perhaps ill-founded at that. Indeed, the learned Recollet friar Chrismann complains bitterly of such arrogance, which especially distinguishes what Newman calls "an aggressive and insolent faction." We shall therefore try to treat nothing as a blunder which does not run against the main current of Roman Catholic teaching, as this may be ascertained out of any familiar Theology or tolerably extended Catechism.

To begin with what is first in our mind—a blunder fundamental but not in the least complicated with ill will—Dr. Charles A. Briggs, in the *New World* for June, 1897, says this, "The Roman Church does not recognize the validity of any orders but her own." The writer could hardly believe his own eyes when he first saw this quoted in the *Sacred Heart Review*, and does not wonder that the editor uttered a loud exclamation of astonishment. A reference to any Theol-

ogy, or to the *Catholic Dictionary*, or to Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon* would have shown the author that Rome acknowledges unhesitatingly the validity of orders in the Greek Church, the Armenian, the Nestorian, the Jacobite, the Coptic, and has never seriously questioned that of the Church of Utrecht, which, indeed, the pope officially describes as "certain schismatical bishops," thus owning the reality of their episcopate. He does not call the Anglicans bishops of any sort, we believe. Rome requires for valid order only unbroken succession, sufficiency of rite, and sacramental intention. Jurisdiction is needful for its regularity, but not for its validity. Say Wetzer and Welte, "We do not question Anglican orders because they are heretical, or because they are schismatical, or because they are excommunicate, but because they come through a broken succession, and are transmitted by insufficient rites." The pope, in the *Apostolica curæ*, lays out his whole strength—we should rather say his whole weakness—on the latter point. He assumes, provisionally, Barlow's previous consecration, and, arguing on this assumption, signifies that even if Barlow were heretical as to orders the Edwardine ordinal, if explicit in a Catholic intention, might perhaps be owned as coercing the consecrators into a valid transmission of the episcopal and sacerdotal character. That the whole question has been settled negatively by the secession of England from Rome is something which has never entered any instructed Catholic head. As the *Catholic Dictionary* says, in the Middle Ages invalidity and irregularity were continually confused, but since the Great Schism, St. Augustine's doctrine, always maintained by the great teachers of the Western Church, has been fully reestablished, namely, that neither heresy nor schism invalidates order, if only it has unbroken succession, adequate ritual, and ecclesiastical intention. Nay, Pope Leo seems to intimate that the last may possibly be dispensable, provided the ritual is so thoroughly explicit as to secure what theologians and the pope himself call "external intention."

To make the matter worse, the Roman doctors—though not all Roman Catholic doctors—ascribe to the Eastern Church, as Döllinger points out, not merely true order, but the power of

the keys, or spiritual jurisdiction. This implies a true mission, from lawful superiors. The whole matter was thus summed up to the writer by his friend, the late Bishop Richard Gilmour, of Cleveland, an Ultramontane of the Ultramontanes: "We own the Greek, Monophysite, Nestorian, and Old Catholic Churches as having true orders. We own the Greek, Monophysite, and Nestorian Churches as having jurisdiction. We own the Anglican Church neither as having true orders nor jurisdiction." The same author, in the same paper, says, speaking of the Roman view of the English, the Scottish, and the Lutheran Churches, "They have no valid ministry, no valid sacraments." This seems to treat the latter defect as involved in the former, which is true of five sacraments, but not of the other two. Baptism has no dependence on order, and marriage only a contingent dependence. Rome teaches, not, as often said, that lay baptism is sometimes valid, but that it is always valid. Indeed, her claim to jurisdiction over us rests on this teaching. To the question, Who is the minister of baptism? Catholic theology answers, "Any human being possessed of reason"—"*quilibet homo compos rationis*." It only requires the application of natural water, actually flowing on the head, in the triune name, "with the intention of administering the rite known among Christians as baptism." It is equally valid, though not equally regular, administered in sickness or health, by priest or layman, man or woman, Catholic or heretic, Jew, Moslem, or pagan. As to marriage Trent solemnly anathematizes any who shall maintain that the ministration of a priest is intrinsically necessary to a valid Christian marriage. And as Rome has always refused to apply the *Læe Clandestinitatis* to Lower Germany and Saxony, Scandinavia, Great Britain, or the Protestant world generally, and by the very terms of this law is restrained from imposing it on them as a body, it follows that all baptized members of these Churches are, as Pope Pius VII expressly says, capable by virtue of their own rites, of contracting valid and indissoluble marriages, which being such, says Pius IX, are *eo ipso* sacramental. All these Protestant Churches, therefore—not speaking of stray offshoots—may, according to Rome, enjoy the fundamental sacrament of ecclesiastical and that of social life.

The other five sacraments, of course, depending on a valid priesthood, are held to be out of their reach.

An eminent author says elsewhere, together with another who in this department is far more eminent than he, "Rome teaches that grace is only given through the sacraments." If they had said, "Rome teaches that grace is principally given through the sacraments," it would have been true. But to say "only" is very wide of the mark. Without baptism no other sacrament, it is taught, can be validly received. "Baptism is the door of the sacraments." Yet grace can be received without baptism, and therefore without any sacrament. The proposition, "Grace is not given out of the Church," has been solemnly condemned by Rome. Nor can it be said that grace may be given to a baptized heretic or schismatic, living in good faith, but not to a Quaker, and still less to a Jew, Moslem, or a pagan. The bull *Unigenitus* knows no such limitation, nor does its now prevailing interpretation. A Roman Catholic is not held bound to say that grace is in fact given to any particular Quaker, Jew, Moslem, or pagan; but if he says that it may not be, or would, as concerns personal sanctification, limit it in form, measure, or effect, he restricts what the *Unigenitus* gives no warrant for restricting. The Rev. E. S. Ffoulkes, while still a Roman Catholic, seems therefore to have been not without warrant in questioning the liberty of a Catholic to put any limit whatever to the possibilities of divine grace outside of the sacraments. Indeed, what Clement XI expressed negatively Pius IX has expressed positively, with emphatic distinctness. Says he, in his encyclical to the bishops of Italy, under date of August 10, 1863:

We and you know that those who lie under invincible ignorance as regards our most holy religion, and who, diligently observing the natural law, and its precepts, which are engraven by God on the hearts of all, and prepared to obey God, lead a good and upright life, are able, by the operation of the power of divine light and grace, to obtain eternal life.

We use Cardinal Newman's translation. This authoritative declaration, addressed to the bishops of the central Catholic nation, and evidently intended *urbi et orbi*, plainly teaches—probably not *ex cathedra*, but in absolute consonance with

present theological consent—that the grace of eternal salvation itself may be rationally viewed as by no means confined within the visible limits of Christianity or of the Christian sacraments.

Within the pale of baptism, again, it is not taught that grace is only given through the sacraments. Indeed, it would be preposterous to say that grace without baptism may even bring a man to eternal life, but that if once baptized he could receive the divine spirit only through the sacraments. This would be to say that God is less bounteous within his Church than without. Theology, moreover, ratified by Trent, ascribes justifying efficacy to perfect contrition and “the ardent desire” of baptism or penance—*votum sacramenti*—where the outer rite may not be had. Moreover, Trent distinguishes the sacramental reception of the Eucharist, the spiritual reception, and the spiritual and sacramental, and ascribes to the last two the same benefit, though presumably in unequal measure. And, say the theologians, while the Eucharist sacramentally can by a layman only be received at most once a day, it can be received spiritually whenever his pious affections are turned toward it, and thus may as a continuing benefit become the vehicle of far greater grace than by the outer reception.

Preaching is not a sacrament, nor even a sacramental. Yet the orthodox bishop Massillon has an essay entitled “Preaching a Greater Mystery than the Eucharist.” In the thirteenth century Saint Louis IX contended against his weaker brother-in-law, our Henry III, that to hear preaching may be more edifying than even to hear the mass. How absolutely inconsistent this view of the canonized king is with the notion that grace is only given through the sacraments! Moreover, it is taught that each increment of grace well used merits more grace, and so in rising measure, by a sort of spiritual compound interest. Thus every internal movement of purity, devotion, benevolence, and every external good work proceeding from it is at once an expression and a channel of grace. The initial point and the principal sustaining force, it is true, are commonly found in the sacraments, yet the chief increments of grace may be received extrasacramentally. And, as we have seen, it is held to be

probable that in some cases—the Jesuits would rather say many cases—grace from initial justification to final glorification has been received altogether outside of the sacraments. As Cardinal Bellarmine says, “God is not limited by our merits, nor by his sacraments.” And, as a Jesuit missionary in Japan said to the Rev. Edward A. Lawrence, who asked him whether certain infant baptisms administered in the wrong form were valid, “No, the Church must have her rules; but then God is very much kinder than the Church.” This is both the teaching and tone of modern Roman Catholic theology, beginning indeed in special fullness about 1650 among the Jesuits, but swollen by a constantly augmenting and now universal current of theological consent, and at last solemnly ratified by pontifical authority.

A most curious and ludicrously blundering use has been made of this false statement as to grace and the sacraments. We have seen in more than one Protestant magazine a picture of two towers, one inscribed “Romanism,” one “Buddhism.” Each is represented as built of large blocks, inscribed in each “Monasticism,” “Processions,” “Asceticism,” “Rosaries,” and so on. One block is labeled in each, “Grace only through Sacraments,” the object, of course, being to show that Roman Catholicism and Buddhism are essentially the same thing. For so pious a purpose, of course, the ingenious artist does not allow himself to be stopped by the fact that Catholicism does not teach that grace is only given through the sacraments, and that Buddhism has no place for either grace or sacraments. Grace is a divine power given in the soul to help it toward God, and a sacrament, in Catholic doctrine, is a visible sign and channel of grace which, to a soul not in mortal sin, infallibly produces its effect. Buddhism, knowing nothing of God, and denying the reality of the soul, can have, of course, no room for either sacraments or grace. Another Protestant, equally desirous of identifying Catholicism and Buddhism, but standing in awe of Max Müller’s remark that Christianity is in principle the direct antipodes of Buddhism, compromises between his malice and his knowledge by saying “Romanism and Buddhism are almost identical except in doctrine,” which is like saying, “William and Henry are almost precisely the

same sort of men, except in character." It is usually thought that when two men or two systems differ fundamentally in character and principles all outer resemblances, however curious and striking, are of the least possible account. Whether Tibetan Buddhism borrowed its outward garb and various particulars of discipline from Catholicism or Nestorianism, or Catholicism from Buddhism, or both from Mithraism, or whether a common humanity has expressed itself in similar ways in all are very interesting and curious questions, but as far as possible from being fundamental. We have borrowed church bells from the Buddhists, but we are not therefore Buddhists. If the Catholics have borrowed rosaries from them, it is a heathenish borrowing, but it does not make them Buddhists. Such a mode of reasoning is abominable.

We have said that almost the worst effect is produced on Protestant feeling by the assumption that every Roman Catholic is supposed to hold his salvation at the will of the pope and therefore is bound, if he would escape hell, to obey every command of the pope. However, there is one popular falsehood that works more malignantly still, that strikes domestic honor in the center, and conveys an insult

That turns the coward's heart to steel, the sluggard's blood to flame.

It is repeated from one pulpit or Church paper to another that the pope has declared all Protestant marriages to be mere "filthy concubinages." The obstinacy with which this calumny is reiterated is beyond belief. Thus a noted clergyman, subsequently for a number of years a leading pastor of Boston, being reminded that the Council of Trent solemnly anathematizes those who declare that there cannot be true Christian marriage without a priest, was capable of answering that he did not know what the Council of Trent might have said, but he did know that Pius IX had declared so. This is as if a man, undertaking to explain our federal jurisprudence, and being reminded that some position of his is flat against the Constitution, should answer that he does not know what the Constitution says, but he does know what Congress has enacted, as if a congressional statute signified anything against the Constitution. Now Trent bears to modern Roman Cath-

olicism essentially the relation which the Constitution bears to federal legislation. Even its disciplinary decrees, where once published in a diocese, are imprescriptible, and can be voided only by a papal derogation, which is granted with much reserve and is never to be presumed. Its doctrinal decrees are irrevocable, and their anathemas strike every baptized person who contradicts them. Had Pius IX contradicted this anathema of Trent, it would simply have swept him out of his seat and joined him to the ignominy of his anathematized predecessor Honorius. In reality, instead of contradicting it, he completes it. The Council requires every Catholic to own that, where the *Lex Clandestinitatis* is not in force—that is, in most Protestant countries—even an unwitnessed nonsacerdotal marriage, Christianly intended, is valid. Pius IX goes further, and expects him to admit not only that it is valid but that it is sacramental. He sweeps out of court, as no longer tenable, the doctrine that the priest is the minister of the sacrament, and will only allow him, for Catholics in Catholic countries, to be a necessary public witness of the contract. Yet these foolish people who are so eager to stir up bad blood between the two religions—as if there were not enough of it already—blunderingly confound “sacramental” with “sacerdotal,” and so make the pope say the exact opposite of what he has really said.

The phrase “filthy concubinages”—which is used by Pius IX in his allocution of September 27, 1852, concerning New Granada, and also subsequently concerning Italy, soon after the introduction of civil marriage into those countries—has not only no reference to Protestant marriages, but none to those of Roman Catholics born and resident in Protestant countries. The pope is simply contending that where Catholics, knowing that in the Catholic regions the Church declares a marriage void which is not contracted before the pastor or his deputy, contract it only before a magistrate, it can only be because they wish to evade Christian obligations and under the name of marriage to enter really into a mere concubinage dissoluble at pleasure. With a few very restricted exceptions this requirement of Trent has never been applied to Protestants, or to Roman Catholics native in and resident of Protestant

countries. The pope, therefore, not only has no reference here to either, but he cannot have had. There are, indeed, Protestant marriages which the prevailing Roman schools must regard as void, but which they are very far from treating as "filthy concubinages." Thus, if two baptized Protestants have the same great-great-grandparent, or are related by marriage within this degree, or are godparent and godchild, in all these cases a marriage between them, being undispensed, is regarded by almost all Roman Catholic divines as null. Yet they never call a marriage agreeable to natural morality "a filthy concubinage," if contracted in good faith. On the contrary, the canon law declares the offspring of all such marriages legitimate. There is only too much uncertainty in the application of this principle, but the principle itself stands firm. No one is so unreasonable as to imagine that Protestants are to be expected to suppose it necessary to apply to Rome or her delegates for a dispensation in such cases, of which they are commonly ignorant, which, moreover, could not easily be granted to them if they did ask for it. Such marriages are held as abstractly null, but not as impugning the moral purity of those who contract them, or as prejudicing the rights of their children. Practically, they are regarded as legally and socially valid, though sacramentally void. Even where an invalid marriage has been contracted in good faith on one side only, as apparently by Agnes of Meran in marrying King Philip Augustus, no difficulty has been made as to declaring the children legitimate. The vast majority of marriages between baptized Protestants, however, have been by innumerable decisions of Rome, resting on the express command of the Council of Trent, pronounced valid, sacramental, and indissoluble. Indeed, so jealous is the holy see of prejudicing this validity that where the Protestant husband or wife of a now Catholic wife or husband has been baptized—but with a doubt remaining as to the value of the baptism, while there is no doubt on the other side—Rome directs that the decision shall always be for validity *in ordine ad matrimonium*. Therefore, if the Protestant, becoming a Roman Catholic, is then provisionally rebaptized, a renewal of conjugal consent is not required nor encouraged.

We admire the genius which packs a great deal of truth into a few words; and we ought, after a sort, to admire the genius which packs a great deal of falsehood into a few words. There is one statement of fourteen words, from a noted preacher, late of Boston, which contains as many falsehoods, and has done as much mischief as ought to satisfy the ambition of any mischief-maker living or dead. It is this, "Rome pronounces null and void every marriage not declared by one of her priests." Let us enucleate the misstatements of this brief proposition. And first, Rome, through Innocent III, confirmed by unbroken previous and following consent, declares all marriages of pagans, Jews, Moslems, not contradicting Christian morality, even though diverging from the positive law of the Church, true marriages and, so long as both parties remain unbaptized, indissoluble. Secondly, in every region which has been Protestant since 1563, and in its Protestant colonies, all Christianly intended marriages of baptized Protestants are declared valid and sacramental. Thirdly, in a great part of the Roman Catholic world, nonsacerdotal marriages between Catholics and baptized Protestants, not contracted in fraud of possible offspring, and therefore not a mere cover for unfruitful sensuality, have been papally declared valid and sacramental. Fourthly, in almost all Protestant regions non-clerical marriages between native and resident Roman Catholics are declared by Rome punishable indeed, but valid and obligatory. The only notable exception to this is the once Catholic belt extending from the west line of Georgia through to the Pacific. Here, for Roman Catholics, the *Lex Clandestinitatis* binds. Fifthly, where, as in France, a Protestant minority had their own system organized before the law of Trent was proclaimed, their marriages are allowed to be valid. This explains why, when the French government receded from its long disavowal of these marriages, the bishops gave Louis XVI thanks for restoring the Protestants to their rights. Sixthly, in Malta, where the *Lex Clandestinitatis* remains by treaty with the Knights of St. John a part of the civil code, the pope has granted a general dispensation from it in case of all Protestant marriages. Seventhly, under the *Lex Clandestinitatis* itself it is not necessary for validity that the priest should

declare anything. If he remains mute; if he is carried to the wedding by force; nay, if he covers his eyes and ears, after once having a glimpse of the intent of the contracting parties, it has been decided that the marriage holds good. His presence in this case is essential; his personal action is not. Eighthly, even under the law of Trent it is not essential that a priest should act. The ministers of the sacrament are the consenting parties; the pastor is only a "public witness." Once instituted in the diocese, therefore, if a bishop, or in the parish, he is at once competent to ratify a marriage, whether yet ordained or not. His deputy, it is true, must be a priest. Ninthly, even where the *Lex Clandestinitatis* is in force, Catholics may contract a nonclerical marriage, before witnesses, if for a month there is no general access to authorized clergymen within the region. We do not suppose we have remembered all the calumnious falsehoods bound up in the sentence of fourteen words before quoted; but we have already more than one to every two words. The reverend author has therefore an unquestionable right to lay claim to a special afflatus and assistance from the Prince of Darkness in inditing it.

It is refreshing to turn now to a statement, apparently erroneous indeed, but not informed with malice. A correspondent, writing some time ago to *The Outlook*, asks whether the opinion ascribed to Ballington Booth's Volunteers, that marriage is a sacrament, does not verge dangerously on Catholicism. The editor reassures him, saying that, as he understands, the Volunteers have an opinion of marriage quite the reverse. This is puzzling. Rome teaches that Jesus Christ, leaving marriage the same in substance as before, but retrenching these which were previously allowed, divorce and polygamy, has raised it to a new spiritual dignity and made it the channel of specific graces, especially for its proper ends. She therefore calls it a sacrament. "Quite the reverse" of this is what we have read in a paper published in Spanish by the missionaries of a Protestant Church. The article denies that marriage is a spiritual companionship, defines it to be a mere bodily association, and jeers at the opinion of its religious dignity and intrinsic permanence as a mere popish superstition. A great divine of our country, also, has lately, in a leading magazine, rebuked the

churches for not being willing to submit themselves, ecclesiastically no less than civilly, to the decisions of the State in matters of marriage and divorce. He accounts it presumption in them, even in the dispensation of their spiritual privileges, to refer themselves to the law of Christ. In this matter Christ is to have no authority in his own Church unless he can obtain the countersignature of Cæsar. Now these opinions are unquestionably "quite the reverse" of the teaching of Rome. But then these opinions are plain heathenism. The missionary and the divine, as to their doctrine of marriage, are not Christians at all. Are we to believe that Dr. Lyman Abbott and Ballington Booth are heathens too? Assuredly not. It is morally certain that both these gentlemen while widely diverging from a great many applications and hard delimitations of the Roman doctrine, agree heartily with the substance of it. Dr. Abbott, indeed, has been willing to incur from unbelievers, in the Church and out of it, the reproach of anarchism by insisting that the mind of God—which he finds centrally in Christ—is the only source of either ecclesiastical or civil authority. Opposing atheism and heathenism so vigorously at large, it is certain that he would never give way to it in this vital quarter. Indeed, *The Outlook* has reported with evident sympathy a proposal to make divorcees *a toro*, indeed, somewhat mere facile, but, as soon as possible, to abolish divorcees *a vínculo* altogether. This is to stand, in fundamental principle, with Rome.

Nor have we any reason to believe anything but that the Volunteers also would abhor both the libertinism of the missionary in the Spanish lands and the Cæsarism of our own divine. Rome, Abbott, and Booth, then, so far as we can see, stand together in the positions noted above, except that the two Protestants scruple over the use of the word "sacrament," which, however, Rome declares important for orthodoxy but unimportant for the validity of marriage. Again and again her tribunals and divines have laid down that where two baptized Christians, canonically competent, have intended, "in prevailing purpose," to contract a Christian union, not evasive of offspring and contemplated as permanent, their marriage is sacramental, whether they call it so or

not. "Christian union" and "sacrament" are in her view for validity equivalent terms. She judges that Christian Protestants do in fact, though not in word, hold marriage to be sacramental, and she seems to have the right of it. Is it said that the Volunteers, with most Protestants, hold that an absolute divorce may be granted for adultery, and perhaps for some other gross offenses? This would induce, indeed, a deep modification of the Roman view, but would be far from a reversal of it. Rome has never doubted that Greek marriages are sacramental, yet the Greek Church grants absolute divorces for adultery. The Council of Trent, while strongly affirming the Roman tenet of indissolubility, have been very careful not to anathematize the Greek opinion. Consequently, while the Western Church courts have always assumed the Roman view, the Church has never proclaimed it *de fide*. Indeed, the Uniate Greeks, though governed by Rome, also pronounce absolute divorces for adultery and the Holy See contents itself with saying, *Ipsi viderint*, "Let them be responsible." It appears then that Dr. Lyman Abbott has here been guilty of a very serious blunder indeed, but of one which, instead of calumniating Catholicism, unadvisedly calumniates himself and his fellow-Protestants—that is, the Christian majority—and puts Rome on a pinnacle of moral superiority on which she protests that she does not stand. It would be refreshing if we could have a few more of these inverted mistakes, which summon the apostolic See to defend our orthodoxy against ourselves.

Let us turn now to something entirely different, on page 689 of Volume VII of Dr. Schaff's *Church History*, edition of 1892. The author has copied as a note a passage from Dr. James Martineau, in which he is speaking of the severities of Torquemada. Martineau leans on the broken reed of Llorente's testimony, whose untrustworthiness has been sufficiently exposed by Prescott, Hefele, and others. Dr. Martineau, however, goes far beyond anything that Llorente gives him warrant for. It makes no great difference, to be sure, whether we allow or disallow Llorente's assignment to Torquemada's inquisitorship of nine thousand deaths and ninety thousand inferior punishments. As Llorente makes out the Spanish Inquisition, from its establishment in 1481 to 1808—

three hundred and twenty-seven years—to have put to death in all thirty thousand persons and punished three hundred and fifty thousand in other ways, mostly by church penances; if we assign nine thousand deaths and ninety thousand other punishments to Torquemada's eighteen years, it only leaves so much the less for the rest of the time. It would make five hundred deaths and five thousand lesser punishments a year for his time, against sixty-five deaths and seven hundred and fifty-five lesser punishments a year for the remaining duration. This disproportion is most unlikely, and can be shown to rest on false reckoning, yet we may let it go. Now for what were these ninety-nine thousand punishments, death, imprisonment, confiscation, penances inflicted by Torquemada? Llorente informs us that the Inquisition took cognizance of heresy, sacrilege, sorcery, violence offered to its own officers, immorality of its own officers, pretended orders, enticement by priests or monks of unsuspecting maidens into supposed marriage by means of forged dispensations or by a pretense of being laymen, unnatural crimes—to which we may doubtless add trafficking in forged indulgences, or relics, pretended prophecies, miracles, and the robbery of monasteries. Before long various purely political offenses were put under its jurisdiction. Now all these multiplied breaches of law or morals Dr. Martineau, by a singular flight of imagination, reduces to the one offense of heresy. "Not for offenses against the moral law," says he, "or crimes against society, but for thoughts of their own about religion, which only God and not the pope had allowed." It is plain that Dr. Martineau has forgotten, or never heard Llorente's own admonition, *Il ne faut pas calomnier même l'Inquisition*. Doubtless in Torquemada's time, when so many Jews and Moors had accepted baptism rather than to leave Spain, there were many more cases of heresy or suspected heresy than later. Yet Dr. Martineau adduces no evidence that these cases were a half or a third of the whole. They may have been two thirds, but he does not show it. Suppose Spain to have been as credulous and cruel about witchcraft as Germany, she should in eighteen years have burnt some three thousand on this charge alone. More or less, it is certain that a large proportion of Torque-

mada's punishments were for real or supposed "offenses against the moral law, or crimes against society."

Dr. Martineau next adds a clause which is not probably, but certainly, calumnious. It is, "Or for being Jews that would not be apostates." Now, in all ages Jews and Moslems were by the unwavering teaching of Rome, as unbaptized, not subject to Church jurisdiction. Mr. H. C. Lea points out how, as soon as the Inquisition was set up in Spain, the current of conversions to Christianity stopped. The Jews preferred their exemption from inquisitorial authority to any advantages they could derive from accepting baptism. Their final banishment from Spain, though heartily supported by national feeling and above all by Torquemada, was the work of neither Church nor Inquisition, but of the civil power. The reiterated complaints and continued interferences of the popes against the harshness and unfairness of the Spanish Inquisition are never directed against the impossible offense of summoning the Jews before its tribunal for refusing to change their religion. The popes aim only at protecting the already baptized Jews and Moors against what appeared to them a cruel suspiciousness of the Spaniards. The Spaniards, it is true, who thought that they knew their own affairs much better than the pope, were very imperfectly attentive to the papal admonitions that they should show greater mildness toward the newly baptized. Cardinal Ximenes stigmatizes Aragon and the pope as the two great enemies of the holy office. Rome, however, never accuses it of undertaking to sit in judgment on those who were outside the jurisdiction of the Church. An unconverted Jew, so long as these remained in Spain, was doubtless like anyone else answerable to the holy office on its civil side for contumelious treatment of Catholicism, but never for a refusal to accept it. Illustrious as James Martineau is in philosophy and ethics, he does not pretend to any eminence as a student of the later Roman Catholicism. As a Protestant and Englishman he simply picks up the slouching stories that have been our meat and drink ever since the days of good Queen Bess. The Spanish Inquisition was so bad, we think, that a few thousand Jews piled upon it are no great matter. It may be wondered, nevertheless, that

Dr. Schaff should have copied Martineau. The connection, however, will show sufficiently how far the venerable author was from any contumeliousness of intent, and that after stripping the note of all its exaggerations it still serves his purpose, which is simply to prove how unreasonable it is to compare Calvin with Torquemada. However, Dr. Schaff in one of his latest letters was kind enough to express to the writer his deep regret that he should, amid so many labors and distractions, have inadvertently copied so distorted a statement, and to promise that the matter should be rectified in the next edition. Let anyone, therefore, who reads the note in question remember that Dr. Schaff himself disavows it.

We have been considering grave matters, and turn now to a matter that is simply comical. A leading divine, speaking of the servile fear that prevailed in the Middle Ages and that is far enough from being extinct yet—the fear of coming directly, with filial confidence, to God—says, as we find him quoted by Mr. Usher: “Mediæval theology assumed an inherent and essential difference between God and man. So it built up a succession of mediators to fill the gap between the Father and his children, a Son to intercede with the Father, a Virgin Mary to intercede with the Son, saints to intercede with the Virgin Mary, and priests to intercede with the saints.” It is news to us that the intercession of the Son with the Father was a fabrication of the Middle Ages. In our simplicity we had supposed it to be a doctrine pervading the New Testament. The intercession of the mother with the Son, for the West at least, undoubtedly came to its height in the Middle Ages. But that the saints are principally regarded as intercessors with the Virgin is another surprising piece of news. St. Bernard, in the *Paradiso*, it is true, intercedes with Mary for Dante, and we believe we have seen some other poetical instances of this. But where has the author quoted ever found a litany of the saints which invokes their intercession with Mary instead of their direct intercession with God? We, at least, have seen a great many such forms, but we are morally certain that we have never yet seen one in use by the people which invokes the intercession of the saints with the Virgin. Her intercession is viewed as far more efficacious than theirs, but it is pre-

cisely the same intercession that is asked of all—the intercession with God, with the Father and the Son. It is never, that we can call to mind, “All ye saints, intercede with the Virgin,” but “All ye holy apostles, bishops and martyrs, all ye holy virgins and widows, St. Paul, St. Ambrose, St. Sebastian, St. Lucy, St. Bridget, etc., pray for us.”

This learned divine has built up for us a regular liturgical “house that Jack built.” According to him this is the scale: “Reverend father, intercede with the saints, that they will intercede with the Virgin, that she will intercede with the Son, that he will intercede with the Father.” If not in direct assertion we have in the complexion of the whole scheme the evident assumption that the people are held unworthy to approach the saints, the priests to approach the Virgin, the saints to approach the Son, and the Virgin to approach the Father. This is ridiculous. Every Christian is authorized to supplicate the Father through the Son. He is taught that it is profitable to supplicate God, especially Christ, through the intercession of Mary. He is also taught that it is well to invoke the intercession of the saints, not with Mary, but with God. Nor does he approach either the saints or Mary through the priests. Every Catholic, man, woman, or child, addresses saints and Virgin directly. Even when the priests lead these devotions it is not as intercessors, but as coryphei. They do not invoke the saints or Virgin for the people, but with the people. This intercession is common and mutual. Every *paternoster* of every man, woman, and child is a direct address to the Father. The priests, however, are, as we know, pre-eminently the intercessors for the people. Their central act of intercession is the mass. And this consists in offering the crucified Son himself, not to the saints, nor to the Virgin, but directly to the eternal Father. This gradation of intercessions has therefore been evoked by the author largely “from the depths of his own moral consciousness.” But the fountain of blunders is too ebullient for one treatment.

Charles C. Starbuck

ART. VI.—ALEXANDER SMITH AND THE “LIFE
DRAMA.”

THE subject of this paper was born at Kilmarnock, Scotland, on the last day of December, 1830. In his early childhood he evinced signs of unusual promise, so that his parents desired to educate him for the ministry; but the hard exigencies of poverty compelled the lad's removal from school. He was placed in a linen factory to follow his father's trade of pattern designer. Here, amid the din of looms, the passion for poesy seized him. He soon found an appreciative and sympathizing patron in the editor of the *Glasgow Citizen*, in whose columns the first products of his literary genius caught the public eye. Through the good offices of a friendly clergyman he found access to an influential London periodical, and soon won the attention and friendly regard of such literary notables as Herbert Spencer and George Henry Lewes.

Glasgow at this period was unusually prolific in amateur poets. Smith was wont to make humorous allusion to the circumstance that upon one occasion he sat down to a banquet table with seventy other poets besides himself. In 1853 the *Life Drama* flashed like a meteor upon the literary world. The factory lad of twenty-three summers suddenly found himself famous. The poem swiftly ran through several editions, the highest literary authorities in England and Scotland bestowing unstinted praise upon it. Great expectations were aroused, and such opinions as the following greeted the new author: “Alexander Smith is a born singer, a man of genius, not a musical echo of other singers;” “It is seldom that a new work is met which furnishes such incontestable evidence of great powers by the author as the *Life Drama*;” “The most striking characteristic of these poems is their exuberance of imagery—fresh, vivid, concrete images actually present to the poet's mind thrown out with a distinctness and a delicacy which only poets can achieve;” “It is impossible to read three consecutive pages without feeling in the presence of a spirit moved with a profound sense of all forms of spiritual beauty.” The *Life Drama* was also compared by one critic

to an Italian harp, "fitful, wild, melancholy, often suggestive of something exquisitely sweet and graceful, but faint, fugitive and incoherent."

Soon after the publication of the *Life Drama* Smith received a clerical appointment in Edinburgh University, with an annual stipend of a hundred and fifty pounds attached. Here his official duties were nominal, and availing himself of his literary leisure he produced in collaboration with another poet a volume of *War Sonnets*. These were followed two years later by his *City Poems*. The publication of these later poems was the signal for the most merciless onslaught of criticism and virulent depreciation to which any poet has ever been subjected. He was boldly charged with wholesale plagiarisms. A coterie of unfriendly critics met together night after night, and by a laborious and elaborate compilation of parallel passages attempted to prove that every passage, phrase, and line, every period and semicolon were stolen outright from Shakespeare, Tennyson, Keats, and Shelley. The criticisms were coarsely cruel and brutally unjust. Smith plagiarized as the flower plagiarizes from the soil, the sunshine, the showers; as the bee plagiarizes from the flowers. Nevertheless, the critics were in positions of authority, and were influential enough to greatly injure the sale and circulation of *City Poems*, which by the fairest tests of criticism showed a marked advance upon the *Life Drama*.

Happily Smith was one of those admirably poised natures which cannot be spoiled by praise nor soured by criticism. Like every genuine poet and artist he found an unfailing source of inspiration in his love of his art:

He was one
Who could not help it, for it was his nature
To blossom into song as 'tis a tree's
To leaf itself in April.

In the midst of this storm of adverse criticism he remarked to a friend, "One does feel these things, and it is queer to come out in the sunlight and walk along the street after you have read columns of violent and abusive criticism; but I find it only takes me just twenty-four hours to get over such things."

He now turned his attention to prose composition and made himself at once a new and distinct reputation as a prose writer—an achievement which finds few parallels in the literary annals of the century. He produced a most charming volume of prose idyls, entitled *Dreamthorp*. This was followed speedily by another rare volume, *A Summer in Skye*, which became very popular and contains his best prose writing. This volume was the inspiration of a romantic marriage to a young lady of the Island of Skye, where he had established a summer home. The book has been highly praised by critics for its quaint charm and sympathy with nature. *Alfred Hogart's Household*, an experiment in fiction, was published in 1866. This, Smith's first and only venture in fiction and his last literary product, was autobiographical in its character. Along with some faults in construction, it was characterized by rare grace of description.

He now turned his thoughts anew to poesy, and meditated bringing his riper and maturer powers to bear upon a great poetic composition and thus fulfill the admonition which he bestowed upon himself in such exquisite lines in the *Life Drama*:

Strive for the poet's crown, but ne'er forget
How poor are fancy's blooms to thoughtful fruits;
That gold and crimson mornings, though more bright
Than soft blue days, are scarcely half their worth.

Upon returning to Edinburgh, at the close of his summer vacation in the Island of Skye, in the autumn of 1866, he contracted a violent cold which developed into malignant diphtheria and hurried him into his grave at the early age of thirty-seven, on January 5, 1867. Almost half a century has elapsed since the obscure Scotch lad emerged from the linen factory in Glasgow to find himself the literary lion of the day. We associate him with the shadowy traditions of a vanished generation, and yet were he living to-day he would be only seventy years old. As to personal traits and characteristics, he was under middle stature, with light brown hair and a placid and shrewd expression of countenance. He was quiet, free from pretense, not explosive nor aggressive in conversation. Silent and reserved in general company, with his familiar

friends he was open, frank, and convivial. One who knew him intimately remarked, "He never said anything silly or untrue." The continuance of criticism upon him, however, even after his death, is well set forth in the following verse:

No sooner was he hence than critic worms
Were swarming on the body of his fame,
And thus they judged the dead:
"This poet was
An April tree whose vermeil-loaded boughs
Promised to autumn apples juiced and red,
But never came to fruit. He is to us
But a rich odor—a faint music-swell.
Poet he was not in the larger sense;
He could write pearls, but he could never write
A poem sound and perfect as a star. His most judicious act
Was dying when he did; the next five years
Had fingered all the fine dust from his wings,
And left him poor as we. He died—'twas shrewd!
And came with all his youth and unblown hopes
On the world's heart, and touched it into tears."

As respects the merits of the *Life Drama*, upon which the fame of Alexander Smith as a poet chiefly rests, it may be conceded that the poem is deficient in dramatic grasp of subject, in metrical quality, in restraint of expression. As a dramatic narrative its parts are somewhat incoherent, its transitions are too sudden, violent, and causeless. It shows perhaps somewhat too obviously the influence of Keats and Tennyson. Yet, after suitable deductions in deference to adverse criticism, it still remains true that the poem is one of the most interesting and remarkable literary products of the century. In a cyclopedia of quotations, entitled *Living Thoughts of Leading Thinkers*, which has been compiled with exceptional literary discrimination, there are twenty-three selections from Shakespeare, eight from Tennyson, and sixteen from the writings of Smith—nearly all being taken from the *Life Drama*. It is scarcely an exaggeration to affirm that no poem has been produced in the century which contains more quotable passages, more instances of rare strength and beauty than the *Life Drama*.

But the crowning excellence of the poem as a dramatic narrative is the splendid moral purpose which pervades it.

When it was published the tone of American criticism was for the most part harsh and uncomplimentary and in some instances coarsely abusive, with an evident tincture of Anglophobia. One of the most impartial of these American reviewers, with a manifest attempt at fairness, misconceives and misjudges the entire character and purpose of the poem, after the following fashion :

Walter, the hero of the poem, is too obviously Alexander Smith breathing forth his own aspirations, pandering to his own sensuous nature, unveiling the repulsive deformities of his own moral character. The grand defect, the damning defect, of the work is in the lack of elevated moral character and correct moral teaching. How sad to find so gifted a spirit reveling in the low and base conception of a putrid heart and distempered brain.

What an amazing and what a melancholy perversion of the critical judgment. One of the most conspicuous merits of the *Life Drama* is the fact that it abounds in lofty moral sentiments, that it makes profound and impressive recognition of religious faith and principles, that it is pervaded and dominated by a lofty moral purpose.

The poem portrays most vividly those vicissitudes of sorrow and disappointment, those processes of moral disillusion, through which human souls are chastened and disciplined and refined from the dross of selfish ambitions and exalted to the high plane of spiritual aspiration and endeavor. The poet hero of the story first appears upon the scene smitten with the passion for fame, consumed with a feverish longing to create an imperishable masterpiece which will win him immortal renown.

For poesy my heart and pulses beat,
For poesy my blood runs red and fleet.
My soul is followed
By strong ambitions to outroll a lay,
Whose melody will haunt the world for aye,
Charming it onward on its golden way.

But out of the vicissitudes of life's experiences there is slowly evolved in the soul of the hero, Walter, that spiritual transfiguration of motive, purpose, and character whereby the passion for fame and fortune gives place to the ennobling pas-

sion for righteousness. With lofty, clarified spiritual vision he exclaims :

One path is clear before us ; it may lead
O'er perilous rocks, cross lands without a well,
Through deep and difficult chasms, but therein
The whiteness of the soul is kept, and that,
Not joy nor pain, is victory.

What poet of our times has given truer, loftier expression to the overmastering passion for righteousness ?

The *Life Drama* makes implied recognition of the three moral alternatives in human life of which every man must make choice. In the parable of the prodigal son Jesus has at least suggested these three great alternatives. The first is a life of dissipation and debauchery, as exemplified in the career of the younger son, who spent all his substance in riotous living. There is again the alternative of a prudent, thrifty, self-content life of Pharisaic propriety, as exemplified in the career of the elder brother, who husbanded his material substance but dwarfed and impoverished his soul. To understand the profound significance of the parable we must put Jesus alongside the two brothers as a type of a God-centered man, suggesting to us the third and highest moral alternative—a life of entire surrender to God, fulfilling the will of God in the service of man. The second alternative, exemplified in the career of the elder brother—a self-seeking, self-centered life of smooth Pharisaic propriety—is the alternative chosen by the average man, because, for the average man, it requires no strenuous moral effort to maintain such a life. There are, however, men of open, magnanimous natures, ardently impulsive, who cannot easily content themselves with the tame monotony of a self-complacent life of Pharisaic respectability. Such men are almost forced to choose the highest ideals and commit themselves to the passionate pursuit of righteousness, or they are in peril of dropping to the low plane of sensuous indulgences, of open debauchery.

Such a man was Walter, the hero of the *Life Drama*. In the poem Smith has powerfully reproduced the parable of the prodigal son. Walter and Violet—the heroine of the story—are brought together. Under the stress of extraordinary temp-

tation these two ingenuous, ardent natures surrender themselves to the flames of passion, and fall from rectitude. Then follow the workings of remorse in the soul of Walter, in which we see portrayed most vividly the exceeding sinfulness of sin :

Hear me, God.

Sin met me and embraced me on the way ;
 Methought her cheeks were red, her lips had bloom.
 I kissed her bold lips, dallied with her hair ;
 She sang me into slumber ; I awoke—
 It was a putrid corpse that clung to me,
 That clings to me like memory to the damned,
 That rots into my being, Father, God !
 I cannot shake it off, it clings, it clings.

As there came to the soul of the despairing prodigal in the parable a vision of the blessedness of his father's house, so to Walter, in the depths of his moral degradation, there comes the majestic vision of a high and glorious manhood. Into the dark night of his remorseful despair God's ideals shine like the eternal stars. He feels the kindling of holy aspiration, of high resolve :

God is a worker,

Why work not I ? the veriest mote that sports
 Its one day life within the sunny beam
 Has its stern duties, wherefore have I none ?
 I will throw off this dead and useless past,
 As a strong runner straining for his life
 Unclasps a mantle to the hungry wind ;
 A mighty purpose rises large and slow
 From out the fluctuations of my soul.

But a more inspiring vision passes before him, the vision of that divine love which glorifies human life and transfigures duty with the light of privilege. He says :

All things have something more than barren use ;
 There is a scent upon the brier,
 A tremulous splendor in the autumn dews,
 Cold morns are fringed with fire ;
 The clodded earth goes up in sweet-breathed flowers ;
 In music dies poor human speech,
 And into beauty blow these hearts of ours,
 When love is born in each.

Life is transfigured in the soft and tender
Light of love, as a volume dun
Of rolling smoke becomes a wreathed splendor.
In the declining sun.

As the consummation of the dramatic story Walter and Violet come together, with spiritualized hopes and purposes ennobled through the discipline of sorrow; and thus, with united hearts and united hands confronting the future in glad and willing surrender to God's high and holy ideals, Walter addresses Violet:

Lift, lift me up by thy sweet inspiration, as the tide
Lifts up a stranded boat upon the beach.
Great duties are before me and great songs,
And, whether crowned or crownless when I fall,
It matters not, so as God's work is done.
I've learned to prize the quiet lightning deed,
Not the applauding thunder at its heels,
Which men call fame.

Our night is past;
We stand in precious sunrise, and beyond
A long day stretches to the very end.

Joseph Luccock

ART. VII.—JOHN WESLEY, CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST.

SOCIALISM and Christian socialism are not one. The former assumes that human society is wrong, and that the whole social order needs readjustment; but, while it proposes methods for righting matters between man and man, it has nothing to say concerning the relations between man and his God. Christian socialism agrees that human society is wrongly adjusted, that the right relations of man to man are not regarded, and that in many cases they are not understood. But it also aims to bring men into right relations to God, their Father, through Jesus Christ the Saviour, and to use the pattern of Christ's life and the principles he taught in the readjustment of the social order. Socialism is sometimes called "scientific socialism" to distinguish it from Christian socialism, as though the latter is unscientific—a claim that all do not admit, because the Gospel, which is the weapon in the hand of the Christian socialist, is itself the science of character and right conduct even more than it is a way of escape from the doom of wrongdoing.

The leaders in Christian socialism have been, as they ought to have been, Christian ministers such as Charles Kingsley, Frederick D. Maurice, and Frederick W. Robertson. We also find Thomas Hughes, Ruskin, and Arthur Dennison among the lay leaders in England, where this movement began. These men undertook to bridge over the great gulf which yawned between the Church and the people, dogma and duty, preaching and practicing, theoretical and applied Christianity. They believed that the Gospel is the panacea for all the individual ills of men and for all the moral maladies of society. Their work was that of going about to do good to the bodies, minds, and homes of men, so that all the interests of humanity may be redeemed from wrong and wrongdoers. The results of their work remain until this day. The inspiration they imparted to the Church and to society in general is too great to be tabulated. As one has written, they regarded the world as "the subject of redemption."

But John Wesley anticipated very many of the aims and

methods of the modern Christian socialists. Scarcely second to, but rather as a part of his great evangelistic movement was his work as a Christian socialist. More than one hundred years before Maurice, Kingsley, and Robertson among the clergy, and Thomas Hughes, Ruskin, and Arthur Dennison among the laity had existed the "Holy Club" at Oxford. Their principles were those that most, if not all, modern Christian socialists would adopt, and are found in the "Introductory Letter" that precedes Wesley's *Journal*, as follows:

I. Whether it does not concern all men of all conditions to imitate Him, as much as they can, who "went about doing good"?

Whether all Christians are not concerned in that command, "While we have time let us do good to all men"?

Whether we shall not be more happy hereafter, the more good we do now?

Whether we can be happy at all hereafter, unless we have, according to our power, "fed the hungry, clothed the naked, visited those that are sick, and in prison;" and made all these actions subservient to a higher purpose, even the saving of souls from death?

Whether it be not our bounden duty always to remember that He did more for us than we can do for him, who assures us, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me"?

II. Whether, upon these considerations, we may not try to do good to our acquaintance? Particularly, whether we may not try to convince them of the necessity of being Christians?

Whether of the consequent necessity of being scholars?

Whether of the necessity of method and industry, in order to either learning or virtue?

Whether we may not try to persuade them to confirm and increase their industry, by communicating as often as they can?

Whether we may not mention to them the authors whom we conceive to have wrote the best on those subjects?

Whether we may not assist them, as we are able, from time to time, to form resolutions upon what they read in those authors, and to execute them with steadiness and perseverance?

III. Whether, upon the considerations above mentioned, we may not try to do good to those that are hungry, naked, or sick? In particular, whether, if we know any necessitous family, we may not give them a little food, clothes, or physic, as they want?

Whether we may not give them, if they can read, a Bible, Common Prayer Book, or Whole Duty of Man?

Whether we may not, now and then, inquire how they have used them; explain what they do not understand, and enforce what they do?

Whether we may not enforce upon them, more especially, the necessity of private prayer, and of frequenting the church and sacrament?

Whether we may not contribute, what little we are able, toward having their children clothed and taught to read?

Whether we may not take care that they be taught their catechism, and short prayers for morning and evening?

IV. Lastly, Whether, upon the considerations above mentioned, we may not try to do good to those that are in prison? In particular, Whether we may not release such well-disposed persons as remain in prison for small sums?

Whether we may not lend smaller sums to those that are of any trade, that they may procure themselves tools and materials to work with?

Whether we may not give to them who appear to want it most, a little money, or clothes, or physic?

Whether we may not supply as many as are serious enough to read, with a Bible, and Whole Duty of Man?

Whether we may not, as we have opportunity, explain and enforce these upon them, especially with respect to public and private prayer and the blessed sacrament?

The date of this writing is December 1, 1730, more than a hundred years before the Christian socialists, Maurice, Kingsley, and Robertson, began their work. But how exactly the aims of the two societies correspond. The same Holy Spirit animates the minds and hearts of both sets of men.

Christian socialism interests itself in the education of the poor. "Free and assisted education for the children" of the needy is its modern watchword. But this, as we have seen, was in the programme of the Holy Club. John Wesley was especially devoted to this object. His very first educational work was the founding of a school in Oxford. He paid the mistress and clothed some, if not all, the scholars. It was ragged school work before ragged schools were thought of. In Kingswood before Methodism had even a site for a chapel the stone for the school for the children of the poor colliers was consecrated by Whitefield and passed over to Wesley to build upon. He did so, and thus began the work of Methodist education. Although this school or its successor eventually became an institution for the sons of Methodist preachers, yet Wesley never ceased his well-begun work for the education of the masses. His school at the Foundry, under

Silas Told, was one of the very first of its kind. Furthermore, he democratized learning by writing, editing, and publishing at what seemed ridiculously low prices text-books and standard reading for the poor. His grammars, logic, histories of England and of the Church, together with his great Christian Library, form part of the four hundred and fifty-three different publications which he issued for the education of the people. Dean Farrar says, "The vast spread of religious instruction by weekly periodicals and the cheap press with all its stupendous consequences were inaugurated by him." This same broad-minded dean says: "The British and Foreign Bible Society, the Religious Tract Society, the London Missionary Society, even the Church Missionary Society owe not a little to his initiative. . . . He gave a great impulse to both national education and to technical education." In initiating an American Methodist college at the first Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church our fathers only followed their leader, who interpreted God's command to love him with all the mind as one to be obeyed. Wesley was no believer in the dogma that "ignorance is the mother of devotion," while his motto for Kingswood School is still good for any school or scholar, "For the Glory of God, the Service of His Church, and of the State."

Christian socialists of to-day work for the emancipation of the white slaves of the factories and the sweatshops. John Wesley had not to meet these conditions. There were no great factory problems in his day. But African slavery existed, and into that evil this social reformer thrust his sword up to the very hilt. What cared he if "Lady Huntingdon trafficked in human nature and George Whitefield held slaves." He roused himself in behalf of the poor trampled bondsmen, denouncing slavery in general as "the sum of all villanies," and American slavery in particular as "the vilest that ever saw the sun." His very last letter was written to that other Christian socialist, who did not know he was one, William Wilberforce, encouraging him in his parliamentary work for the emancipation of slaves. Miss Braddon, in her recently published book, *The Infidel*, represents Wesley as silently approving of Whitefield's purchase of more slaves, because he

did not then and there protest against slavery. But, having received more light on Wesley's attitude toward the abomination, she promises to remove the passage from further editions of the book.

The twin evil of slavery was and is drunkenness. Like some other early temperance reformers Wesley was not himself a teetotaler. He used wine and beer in moderation; but ardent spirits, the distillers, the venders, and the drinkers thereof as a beverage he most ardently denounced. Some of the strongest utterances against drunkards and drunkard-makers came from his tongue and pen. The swearer is preached to, and is then pressed with a special tract, as is also the smuggler. How much the British government saved by his little tract, "A Word to a Smuggler," it would be impossible to tell. He preached and wrote against the evils of his day. He also expelled from his Societies those who would not heed his warnings and desist from such wrongdoing. The briber and the bribe receiver also shared the same fate. "Show me thy faith by thy works" was his motto. He sought to make men good citizens of earth, as the very best preparation for citizenship in heaven.

Christian socialism undertakes the task of showing the rich their duties and privileges toward the poor. Unlike scientific socialism it does not believe in the equalization of capital, but it does believe in its moralization. Wesley spoke out on this subject as boldly perhaps as any man of his day. He has also written on this subject. His sermons on "The Use of Money," "The Good Steward," and the "Reformation of Manners" are good socialistic tracts for these modern times. We wonder such Christian socialists as Professor Herron does not often refer to them. Wesley first spoke and then wrote burning words on the wrong use of money, and illustrated his sermons by his own daily life of caring for the poor. The rules of the Holy Club, as we have seen, show its members to have all been Christian socialists in this very important respect. From his student days, when he even parted with the pictures from his walls, until an old man eighty-eight years of age we see Wesley tramping London streets in the melting snow, begging money for the poor and, like his Mas-

ter, going about doing good. During his life he gave away more than \$200,000.

His methods of helping the poor were such, one hundred and sixty years ago, as we now follow. We boast that we have learned to help them without pauperizing them; the "Associated Charities" has taught us this. Wesley's plan was to immediately relieve present necessity, then at once help the poor to help themselves. He knew that to give a hungry man a loaf of bread only would be to cause him to look to him for another when that was eaten. He rather gave him an inspiration and also an opportunity for getting another loaf for himself by honest toil. For those who lack employment the good Christian socialist opens a bureau, to which the "out-of-work" may come and find employment. John Wesley did more than this. He made his chapels not only bureaus but workshops. Thus he gave the poor man who was out of employment a chance to help himself. On Tuesday, November 25, 1740, he writes in his *Journal*:

After several methods proposed for employing those who were out of business, we determined to make a trial of one which several of our brethren recommended to us. Our aim was, with as little expense as possible, to keep them at once from want and idleness; in order to which, we took twelve of the poorest and a teacher into the Society room, where they were employed for four months, till spring came on, in carding and spinning of cotton. And the design answered. They were employed and maintained with very little more than the product of their own labor.

Thus for four months the place of worship was also the place of work. Carding, spinning, and praying were done in the same auditorium. This was not considered a desecration of the house of prayer. Frequently the naves of old churches and cathedrals were used as market places on stormy days. The chancel only was kept for sacred uses, but business was done within sight of the altar, instead of in sight of the cross in the market place. Six months later new needs called for new methods. On Thursday, May 7, 1741, Wesley writes:

I reminded the United Society that many of our brethren and sisters had not needful food, many were destitute of convenient clothing, many were out of business and that without their own fault, and many sick

and ready to perish; that I had done what in me lay to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to employ the poor, and to visit the sick; but was not alone sufficient for these things, and therefore desired all whose hearts were as my heart: 1. To bring what clothes each could spare, to be distributed among those that wanted most. 2. To give weekly a penny, or what they could afford, for the relief of the poor and sick. My design, I told them, is to employ for the present all the women who were out of business, and desire it, in knitting. To these we will first give the common price for that work they do, and then add according as they need. Twelve persons are appointed to inspect these, and to visit and provide things needful for the sick. Each of these is to visit all the sick within their district every other day, and to meet on Tuesday evening to give an account of what they have done and consult what can be done further.

The Wesleyan idea of labor and the laborer may be learned from Charles Wesley's hymns for the workingman. He sent him about his daily toil singing the high praises of his God. For his waking and rising, on a workday, the following words were adopted :

Are there not in the laborer's day
Twelve hours, in which he safely may
His calling's work pursue?
Though sin and Satan still are near,
Nor sin nor Satan can I fear,
With Jesus in my view.

Ten thousand snares my path beset,
Yet will I, Lord, the work complete,
Which thou to me hast given;
Regardless of the pains I feel,
Close by the gates of death and hell,
I urge my way to heaven.

It is now time for the workman to put on coat and hat and kiss his wife and children good-bye. As he leaves his home for the place of toil, Wesley sets him singing to Christ the hymn entitled, in the present Methodist Hymnal, "Beginning the labors of the day: "

Forth in thy name, O Lord, I go,
My daily labors to pursue;
Thee, only thee, resolved to know,
In all I think, or speak, or do.

Thee will I set at my right hand,
 Whose eyes mine inmost substance see;
 And labor on at thy command,
 And offer all my works to thee.
 Give me to bear thy easy yoke,
 And every moment watch and pray;
 And still to things eternal look,
 And hasten to thy glorious day.
 For thee delightfully employ
 Whate'er thy bounteous grace hath given;
 And run my course with even joy,
 And closely walk with thee to heaven.

The man has now reached his work, and has "gotten on to his job," as he himself would say. Charles Wesley then sets him singing at his labor as follows:

Summoned my labor to renew,
 And glad to act my part,
 Lord, in thy name my work I do,
 And with a single heart.
 End of my every action thou,
 In all things thee I see:
 Accept my hallowed labor now,
 I do it unto thee.
 Whate'er the Father views as thine,
 He views with gracious eyes;
 Jesus, this mean oblation join
 To thy great sacrifice.
 Stamped with an infinite desert,
 My work he then shall own;
 Well pleased with me, when mine thou art,
 And I his favored son.

When the day's service is done and the workman stands looking at it, Wesley has him sing the following hymn for the consecration of his labor:

Son of the carpenter, receive
 This humble work of mine;
 Worth to my meanest labor give,
 By joining it to thine.
 Careless through outward cares I go,
 From all distraction free;
 My hands are but engaged below,
 My heart is still with thee.

O when wilt thou, my life, appear ?
 Then gladly will I cry,
 "'Tis done, the work thou gav'st me here,
 'Tis finished, Lord," and die !

This is a picture of the early Wesleyan laboring man. He has been taught to lift his toil, menial though it seem, up to that plane where he could do it as unto the Lord.

Wesley also fortified the employer with hymns such as the following for the beginning of a new business day :

I and my house will serve the Lord :
 But first, obedient to his word
 I must myself appear ;
 By actions, words, and tempers show
 That I my heavenly Master know,
 And serve with heart sincere.

I must the fair example set ;
 From those that on my pleasure wait
 The stumbling-block remove ;
 Their duty by my life explain,
 And still in all my works maintain
 The dignity of love.

Lord, if thou didst the wish infuse,
 A vessel fitted for thy use
 Into thy hands receive :
 Work in me both to will and do ;
 And show them how believers true,
 And real Christians, live.

For him in the rush and whirl of business on the exchange or in the market place Wesley wrote :

Lo ! I come with joy to do
 The Master's blessed will ;
 Him in outward works pursue,
 And serve his pleasure still.
 Faithful to my Lord's commands,
 I still would choose the better part,
 Serve with careful Martha's hands,
 And loving Mary's heart.

Thou, O Lord, my portion art,
 Before I hence remove !
 Now my treasure and my heart
 Are all laid up above ;

Far above all earthly things,
While yet my hands are here employed,
Sees my soul the King of kings,
And freely talks with God.

Is it to be wondered that such employers and employees both prospered? That such a spirit infused into the minds of capitalist and laborer gave dignity to toil? With this spirit the employer did not regard his operatives as "hands" but as souls. No wonder the Methodists have grown rich and are now able, on the other side of the Atlantic, to lay a million guineas on God's altar, and, on this side, two million eagles as a thank offering for the blessings of the past century. The Wesleys made songs for the laborer and his employer, and cared not so much who made economic laws for them. They sought to Christianize both, knowing all else would soon right itself. How strikingly these hymns contrast with the songs of socialists on labor and capital, employer and employee.

John Wesley was also a physician. Multitudes of the poor were sick, and could not afford a doctor. There was probably not a free medical dispensary in all England when Wesley began his Christian socialistic work. In 1746 he solved the difficulty by what he calls a "desperate expedient," saying, "I will prepare and give them physic myself." For twenty-six years he had made anatomy and physic a diversion; at forty-three he takes up the study and practice of medicine, engaging an apothecary and a surgeon to assist him. In three months he had above three hundred patients and had used over forty pounds' worth of medicines. After three years' practice he did not know of one patient who had died on his hands. In 1747 he opened a free dispensary at the Foundry, in London, and four months later one in Bristol. Writing to Blackwell the banker, January 26, 1747, he says that in the latter dispensary alone he has over two hundred patients, the number increasing daily. A year later he writes:

We have ever since had great reason to praise God for his continued blessing on this undertaking. Many lives have been saved, many sicknesses healed, much pain and want prevented or removed. Many heavy hearts have been made glad, many mourners comforted, and the visitors have found him whom they serve a present reward for all their labor.

For the poor and sick who could not come to him he provided visitors—first promiscuous, then organized. Forty-six of these divided London into twenty-three districts, and each sick person was visited by two of these, three times a week. The four rules for visitors were: "(1) Be plain and open in dealing with souls. (2) Be mild, tender, patient. (3) Be cleanly in all you do for the sick. (4) Be not nice." Three years later, in 1777, The Willow Walk Society near Moorfields, but, more generally and properly speaking, "The United Society for Visiting and Relieving the Sick," was organized. This was superseded by the "Strangers' Friend Society," for which Wesley drew up rules about a year before he died. He says of it, "So this is also one of the fruits of Methodism." Royalty patronized it for years. In 1868 there were made 32,460 visits by its three hundred and fifty volunteer workers. It is still doing Christlike labor among all sorts and conditions of the poor and sick, irrespective of denomination or nationality. This was a part of John Wesley's Mercy and Help Department, and this year celebrates its one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary. For those who could not come to him and for general domestic use he wrote *Primitive Physick*, a book whose first edition was issued on June 11, 1747, and which went through twenty-seven editions in England, the last one coming out in 1850. In his works Wesley also published Dr. Tissot's *Advice with Respect to Health*. He was up to date in his treatment of disease. For instance, on November 16, 1747, having heard of the electrical machines, he went to see them in use. On March 17, 1753, he studies Dr. Franklin's *Letters on Electricity*, and on February 4, 1768, he reads Dr. Priestley's "ingenious book on electricity." Like a true Christian socialist, in short, he believed in and worked for the redemption of the bodies of men from disease, as well as their souls from sin. Twenty-four of the thirty-four recorded miracles of Jesus were wrought upon the sick, and Wesley was a true disciple of the Great Physician.

For widows and orphans Wesley also made provision. Fifteen sick widows were housed at the Foundry, eating at the same table as did Wesley and his preachers. The third chapel he built, at Newcastle-on-Tyne, was called "The Orphan

House of Wesley." His first chapel was also designed to be a home for orphans. It still stands, the very first of all the Methodist churches, in Broadmead, Bristol, fifteen minutes' walk from the orphan homes of the late George Müller. One year before he died, Wesley also founded in Dublin an almshouse for aged Methodists, which is still prospering.

Wesley also acted as banker for the poor. About the middle of 1746 he saw that some needy men could be started in business for themselves if they had a little capital. He set to work and begged £30 16s. to begin with. In a year and a half no less than two hundred and fifty-five persons had been helped. Only one pound at a time would he lend, and it was to be paid back weekly within three months. This scheme pleased all sorts of wise people, even an eminent deist sending him a guinea toward this fund. It is said that many a successful London tradesman was started in business in this way. In Bristol, Wesley started a "Provident Society," a kind of savings bank for the poor. Some Bristolians did not like this, and ridiculed him. A gorgeously colored picture was issued representing Wesley pouring out sacks of gold, and, while his followers were stowing away the coin, the powers of darkness were dragging Wesley away, but not to the higher regions. This was his solution of the capital and labor question. He helped the laborer to become a capitalist by his "Provident Society," and the capitalist to aid the laborer by his loan fund. Thus he brought together capitalist and laborer, anticipating savings banks and lending clubs for the poor.

From these facts we conclude that the earliest Methodism was truly of Christian socialistic spirit. This is recognized by such writers as Canon Moore Ele, who, in his Hulsean Lecture, affirms, "The man who did the most to reform the social life of England in the last century was John Wesley." His earliest followers took up the work of elevating the masses socially, as well as spiritually. But, with the opening of the nineteenth century, Wesley being no longer with his organization the Methodists as a people began to slide back from the advanced position they had taken in social matters. Through nearly the whole of the century we have been emphasizing the evangelistic, at the expense of the socialistic,

work for which we were partly raised up. For a couple of decades past, on both sides of the Atlantic, we have been trying to return to our former work, and to regain our position. The great forward movements of Manchester, London, Birmingham, and other centers in England, as also in New York, Chicago, and other American centers; the deaconess movement; homes for children and the aged; Methodist hospitals and institutional churches are all attempts to return to our great commission of saving the bodies, minds, and daily lives of the people, for the redemption of whose souls Christ has died. The Salvation Army has been wiser than we. The careful student of its work from the beginning will feel that, for some years past, simply as an evangelistic agency, it has been a declining force. That noble son of Wesley, General Booth, at once saw that something must be done. The novel and startling methods of calling attention to the need of the salvation of the soul no longer would attract. Old circus buildings, theaters, jam factories, skating rinks, stables, and such places which once were packed to suffocation, and which once rang with hallelujahs, were now well-nigh deserted. The congregations had dwindled from thousands to scores at the most. Then General Booth added Christian socialism to growing evangelism. He began to care for the bodies, houses, minds, families, and all the other interests of men. He struck boldly out for the redemption of the whole man, not only from sin but from all its present, as well as its future, consequences. He began to fight dirt and debt, as well as drink and other doings of the devil. *In Darkest England and The Way Out* was his slogan cry which reached the ears and opened pockets of philanthropists in all English-speaking lands. The Army put on new life, with its new activities. We incline to think that, but for this socialistic new departure, it would now be a thing of the past.

The sooner Methodism imitates the socialistic departure of the Salvation Army, at least in the underlying principles, the sooner shall we be found in the old paths. Had Methodism lived up to her high calling and privileges and never have narrowed down to almost exclusively evangelistic and family church work, there would have been no need of the Young

Men's Christian Association, nor of many of the fraternal orders and mutual benefit societies which attract men and too often absorb their attention, to the neglect of the Church and worst of all to the neglect of Christ's great salvation. When a man is won from his cups and cards he needs a place to go to and friends to meet of the other kind, or his very loneliness may drive him back to his former life. The coffeehouse, with its well-lighted reading room and refreshments at a little above cost and its company of good people, will soon place him where he can stand alone, and will then put him where he can help others. It is not enough to get him converted; his environment must also be changed. His work only begins when he has repented and believed to the saving of his soul. His body, his social nature, and his home must also be benefited. In certain parts of Ireland, in John Wesley's days, the Methodist homes could be distinguished by their outside appearance. The windows and doorsteps were clean, and the walks in front of them were swept. Clean hearts were followed by clean houses. Wesley is credited with the saying that "cleanliness is next to godliness," but we rather think that he regarded it as a part of godliness.

The method of this great Christian socialist was philosophical and scriptural. He sought to reform society by first securing the regeneration of the individual. His method was from center to circumference, and not from circumference to center. His idea was that the very best way to change a man's environment is to change his moral condition. Christianize him, and his social life will be Christianized. Wesley understood that the new kingdom to be established on the earth is to be made up of a new humanity, and that Christ through his Gospel is now making all things new. He combined the zealously evangelistic with the decidedly Christian socialistic, the one a complement of the other. Were he with us to-day we think he would say, "Go ye and do likewise."

W. H. Meredith.

ART. VIII.—THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF BAPTISM.

WHAT have the early Christian monuments to say concerning the mode of baptism? The answer to this question must be found in its patient and scientific study. The student has been busy during the last few decades in critically reexamining the early Christian mosaics and catacomb frescoes, the attention of a brilliant circle of archæologists having been focussed upon these monuments. Easily first in this circle, now that the learned Commendatore De Rossi has left us, is Monsignor Wilpert, of the Campo Santo Vaticano, at Rome. He has cleaned out some catacomb chambers, discovered new frescoes, and corrected certain errors of interpretation by the earlier copyists—the result being that the recent thorough reexamination of these chambers has started up afresh the discussion concerning the story the early Christian paintings have to tell, and that consequently the representations of baptism in early Christian art naturally come up for a fresh discussion.

In examining these monuments, as well as in the study of the entire circle of Christian art, we are impressed with the fact that there is, generally speaking, one uniform mode of representing baptism. The subject always stands in the water, whether it be stream or font. Fresco, mosaic, and sculpture with rare exceptions adhere to this treatment. Not in one instance is the subject represented as going under the water or emerging from a submersion. The ministrant is always represented as placing his hand upon the head of the subject, or pouring water—sometimes from the hand, sometimes from a vessel—upon the head of the subject. In later representations the vessel is shown, which is sometimes a shallow dish or paten, at other times a jar, or *ampulla*. In some instances the dove, which is usually present, hovering above the head of the subject, holds in its beak the inverted *ampulla*, from which the water pours. It is claimed by the immersionists that these representations are all in harmony with the practice of immersion, and that the act represented in Christian art is the final act or moment when the subject is receiving the

"chrism," or crowning ceremony of baptism. "The artist," says the immersionist, "limited to one moment in the administration of the rite, has chosen to portray the completed act, and consequently we have no representation of the intermediate stages, such as the going into the water or going under the water."

The typical Christian monument used to support this view, in the most recent discussion of this subject,* is the celebrated mosaic in the Church of San Giovanni in Fonte, at Ravenna, which dates from the early part of the fifth century. Christ stands in the water, while John, who holds in his left hand a jeweled cross, extends his right hand over the head of the Saviour, holding in it a shallow dish or vessel from which something is evidently poured upon the Lord's head—"oil of the chrism," says the immersionist. Above floats the dove, symbolizing the presence of the Holy Spirit. In some of the representations of this mosaic the contents of the vessel are seen falling upon the head of the Saviour, but the most recent photographs show merely the extended hand holding the dish. Yet the presence or the absence of the falling contents is not important. The immersionist holds that this dish is the paten which held the sacred chrism, that it was not water which is poured from it, and that there is never in these representations of baptism the pouring of water, but the act of chrism, the completing ceremony in immersion.† Now, concerning this mosaic recent criticism has much to say. Dr. Osgood in the article already noticed remarks: "The very fact that this picture has remained the pattern of similar representations to the present day is a testimony to its high artistic value and power. Until something better has been invented this mosaic will continue to be regarded as the great masterpiece." He also states that it was after this that Giotto copied his picture of the baptism, in the Church of Maria Del Arena, in Padua—a statement made by Richter in his discussion of the mosaic.‡ But careful study of this picture by eminent archæologists shows that it has been greatly restored, so greatly as to destroy its

* Howard Osgood: "The Archæology of Baptism," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1898.

+ Howard Osgood, *supra*.

‡ J. P. Richter: *Die Mosaiken von Ravenna*. Wien, 1878.

evidential value in the case. Ricci, in Ravenna, and Richter, in his work already alluded to, admit that the neck and right arm of Christ have been restored. Crowe and Cavalcaselle * hold that the head, shoulders, and right arm of the figure of Christ and the same parts of the figure of John, and also his right leg and foot, have been restored. Stryzowski † holds, further, that the discus held in the hand of John is a restoration from the fourteenth or fifteenth century. The reason for his opinion is that we do not find in Italy or elsewhere previous to the period of the fifth century any representations in which John holds such a discus in his hand. Stryzowski is followed in the same opinion by Kraus, ‡ who affirms that the restoration is so great that we can base no definite conclusions upon it as an original picture. He characterizes Richter's judgment that Giotto copied his picture from it as wholly untenable—“*eine ganz unhaltbare Behauptung.*” These opinions are based upon a careful study of Christian art; their correctness will be seen on further discussion of the subject.

There is one monument previous to the fifth century in which John holds in his hand a vessel similar to that in the Giovanni in Fonte picture. It is a sarcophagus lid in the Lateran Museum, ascribed to the fourth century. It was taken from a Roman cemetery. The subject stands in the water, beneath an overhanging rock from which the water streams upon him. Here for the first time we find the motive of the shallow dish or paten in the hand of the ministrant. But on examining this sculpture we discover that it has suffered restoration in the arm and head of the Baptist and the head of the Saviour. The dish in the hands of the Baptist is evidence of a mediæval artist. Stryzowski well says, “The restoration according to which John pours water out of a dish upon the head of the Saviour is, according to the analogy of the previous representations, decidedly false.” § He further shows that the stream of water pouring from the rock ought to have suggested the true lines of restoration. There is no

* *History of Italian Painting.*

† *Ikonographie der Taufe Christi.* Wien, 1885.

‡ *Geschichte der altchristlichen Kunst*, vol. i, p. 428. Freiburg, 1896.

§ *Opus Cit.*, p. 6.

further representation of such a discus or paten in the hands of the baptizer in Christian art until we come to the fourteenth century. If the San Giovanni mosaic is the pattern for all similar representations, it is marvelous that for a thousand years this particular pattern should be so ignored. We meet with the discus in the fourteenth century and frequently thereafter. One of the earliest instances is in an ivory in the Hotel de Clugny, in France. From this onward it is common, so that we find it in Giotto, Pisano, Perugino, Signorelli, Raphael, and others. Professor Osgood affirms that the discus, as seen in the Giovanni in Fonte mosaic, is the true type, and laments that it has degenerated in the following centuries into the dove holding the inverted *ampulla* in its beak. But, if this is true, why do we find so suddenly in the fourteenth century a reverting to the ancient type? He would say because the old painters copied the mosaic. But why had they not copied it during the past thousand years? It was well known throughout the world of Italian and German art. The San Giovanni type was not a discovery suddenly revolutionizing the Christian art of the fourteenth century. The inference rather is that the fingers of the fourteenth century have tampered with the early mosaic and impressed the fourteenth century type upon it. It is the same influence which restored the Lateran sarcophagus.

This mosaic has not then furnished the typical representation in Christian art of Christian baptism. Far from it. It is undoubtedly a Byzantine picture, but the restoration is not Byzantine. It is, therefore, in the light of archæological criticism not reliable as a type of Christian baptism in the fifth century. In our opinion, the better picture for this purpose and the one which was in all probability modeled after the original, unrestored Giovanni in Fonte, is the baptismal scene in the dome of the neighboring Ravenna Church of Santa Maria in Cosmedin which was built fifty years later and under the same artistic influences. John is here represented as simply resting his hand on the Saviour's head. If the fresco of Giovanni in Fonte, in its present form, is the true type, it is singular that the artist of the mosaic in Santa Maria in Cosmedin, composing his picture of the baptism fifty years

later, should dare to omit such an essential feature as the paten in the hand of John, which indicated the culminating of the baptismal ceremony with the rite of chrism. He has clearly not followed that pattern, but has followed the early type as seen in the catacomb pictures. The two mosaics must originally have been nearly identical in their representation of John's attitude. The discrediting of this celebrated mosaic does away with it as an illustration of baptism by affusion in the fifth century, but illustrations of the practice may be seen elsewhere.

The most ancient picture of the baptism of Christ, according to Wilpert, and one of the finds in Christian archæology of the last decade, is in the catacomb of Petrus and Marcellinus.* The Saviour appears as a young boy. His arms are uplifted in prayer—the only representation in Christian art of Christ as an orant. The hands of the Baptist rest upon the head of the Saviour, who stands in shallow water. Above hovers the dove. A similar fresco, as to the act of baptism, is found in the catacomb of St. Calixtus, in chamber A.† The next great fresco of the baptism of Christ is found in the Chapel of the Sacraments, St. Calixtus, chamber A.‡ It is assigned by De Rossi to the latter part of the second century or the beginning of the third. The subject stands in the water a little above his ankles. The hand of the Baptist rests upon the boy's head, while sprays of water spring from the hand and fall on each side, indicating sprinkling or pouring. The immersionist maintains that these sprays are not water. One interpreter stoutly asserts that they are rays of fire.§ Another questions the integrity of the fresco itself and, referring to the recent critical study of the catacomb frescoes, implies that these sprays of water will be found to be the addition of a later age in the interest of baptism by affusion.¶ We turn again to the brilliant German archæologist who has placed the Christian world under a lasting obligation by his scientific treatment of these monuments. He has discussed the Chapel of the Sacraments of St. Calixtus in a special pub-

* Wilpert: *Die Kat. der Heiligen Petrus und Marcellinus*. Freiburg, 1891.

† *Ibid.*: *Die Mauerbilder der Sacramentskapellen des Heiligen Callistus*. Freiburg, 1897.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ Armitage: *History of the Baptists*.

¶ Howard Osgood: *Opus Cit.*

lication, in which appears an original photograph of the identical picture. A letter addressed to him asking him whether in his opinion these sprays of water were the addition of a later age brought in return a courteous reply with the statement: "We see here, about the head of Christ, numerous sprays of water, an evident indication of baptism by affusion (*Hier sieht man um den Kopf Christi, eine Menge Wasserstrahlen, ein offener Hinweis auf die Taufe per infusionem*). The same interpretation has been given to this fresco by Stryzowski, * Dewaal, † Kraus, ‡ De Rossi, § and others.

It is objected that this cannot be sprinkling or pouring, "for who ever saw water spring this way when sprinkled from the hand upon the head? But we must not hold the catacomb artist too closely to the rules of the artist's technique. The cemetery artist is never a proper guide in art canons. He merely suggests. His work is crude at best, but clear enough to tell what he wishes to say. The story he here tells cannot be mistaken, though it is crudely told. The picture is genuine and indicates that affusion or aspersion was part of the ceremony of baptism. We have no evidence in the picture of chrism. If sprinkling was practiced in this case—and this is the only rational interpretation of the picture—then in all probability it was practiced in the other instances, though not indicated by the artist. The picture stands clearly in the way of the theory that baptism is exclusively by immersion and that all representations in Christian art indicate the application of chrism as the crowning ceremony. Hence the impugning of its genuineness and the selecting as a type of the mosaic of Giovanni in Fonte. Professor Osgood remarks concerning this fresco, "If it represents sprinkling it forms the single exception in one thousand years of Christian literature and art."

Let it be conceded that trine immersion was practiced in the second century, as is evidenced by Tertullian and others. The question is whether we have any evidence that aspersion or affusion was in use also. Let us make further inquiry into Christian art. There are in Christian art and literature dis-

* *Opus Cit.*

† "*Die Taufe Christi auf vorconstantinische Gemälde.*" *Römische Quartalschrift*, July, 1896. ‡ *Geschichte der Alterth. Kunst*, vol. 1, p. 164. Freiburg, 1896.

§ *Bulletino di Arch. Cristiana*, iv, 4, 19, 20.*

tinet evidences to this fact. There are four notable examples from the fourth century. The first is in the *Academia Reale d'Istoria* in Madrid.* The baptism of Christ is shown in one of the seven pictures which adorn a sarcophagus. Here we see the subject standing in the water. The hand of the ministrant rests upon the head of the subject. From a large vessel on which perches a dove pours a copious stream of water. This is assuredly no chrism, where a little oil is applied to the head. The artist evidently intends to show the pouring of water, from the size of the vessel used. The second example is likewise a sarcophagus, to which allusion has already been made. The discus in the hand of the Baptist is a restoration, but the stream of water pouring from the rock upon the head of the Saviour is a part of the original sculpture. The third example from the fourth century is found in *Aquileia*. The most accurate copy of it is given in Wilpert's brochure in the *Ephemeris Salonitana*. The subject stands in a shallow font or basin. Upon him from above pours a copious flood of water which seems completely to envelop him. We are told by the immersionist that this flood which pours upon the neophyte is oil, the oil of chrism!

In the eighth and ninth centuries we shall find further evidence. The first picture, as far as we know, in which the pouring of the water and the chrism are distinguished is from northern Italy, in the Church of San Giovanni in Fonte, in Monza. It is ascribed to the year 700. The Baptist holds in his left hand a small vessel containing the sacred oil, as if ready for the chrism which has not yet been applied. He touches the Saviour's head with his left hand. The dove holds in its beak the *ampulla* from which water pours upon the head of the Saviour. Even if we interpret that the hand resting upon the Saviour's head is administering chrism, the vessel above surely indicates the pouring of water.

The same motive is seen in the altar cloth of the Church of St. Ambrose, at Milan, of the year 827, where an attendant standing on a stool lifts a large jar with both hands and pours it over the head of the subject. We notice the same in an Italian ivory from the same period—now in Berlin. That

* Stryzowski, *Opus Cit.*, p. 6.

this is water and not the chrism appears clearly from the fact that the practice of pouring water in baptism called forth a definite deliverance, it being a substantial rebuke, from the Council of Cellichyt or Calcuit, held 816, which gave the following admonition, "Also let the presbyters, when they perform baptism, know that they are not to pour the water on the heads of the children, but always to immerse the same in the font." * In the light of this admonition we are able to interpret the pictures of the period. It teaches us most clearly that affusion was practiced. What becomes of the statement that the catacomb picture forms the single exception in one thousand years, when we see that a Church council in the early part of the ninth century cautions the presbyters that the right way to baptize is not to pour water on the heads? It substantially says, "Let the presbyters stop the custom of pouring water in baptism."

The pictures of Giotto, Perugino, Signorelli, Raphael, and others were painted at a time when the practice of pouring which we saw rebuked in the ninth century had spread throughout the Church, and their pictures certainly represent this custom, which was then in vogue. We know that affusion or aspersion had become general in the Western Church by the thirteenth century.† The Synod of Ravenna, held in 1311, affirms concerning the rite of baptism, that it may be administered "*sub trina aspersione vel immersione*."‡ The restoration of the fresco of San Giovanni in Fonte was probably made at this very period, and surely as the exponent of the teaching of this council, and represents the "*trina aspersione*." It is seriously to be questioned, according to Kraus, whether chrism is ever represented in Christian art.§ Tertullian and Justin Martyr assure us that it was applied after the act of baptism and the issuing from the font: "After this, when we have issued from the font (*lavacro*), we are thoroughly anointed with the blessed unction."|| "They were anointed with the precious ointment after baptism, in remembrance of Him who reputed the anointing of himself with oil

* Hefele: *Conciliengeschichte*.

† Augusti: *Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Chr. Arch.*

‡ Hefele: *Conciliengeschichte*. § Kraus: *Gesch. der Chr. Kunst*, vol. I, p. 165.

|| Tertullian: *De Baptismo*, chap. vii.

to be his burial." * The words, "after the baptism," do not mean after the immersion and while yet standing in the water, but after leaving the font. What then does the stereotyped form of resting the hand on the head signify, in the pictures of baptism? The catacomb fresco under discussion says in effect that it is the act of aspersion accompanied no doubt with the words of benediction; or it may also represent the laying on of hands which was a part of the ceremony.

It is objected that this catacomb picture contradicts the literature of the early Church, which considers baptism by affusion a heresy. But are we to discard as spurious all those representations on the Christian monuments that have no sanction in the literature of the period? Furthermore, the literature of the period is not wanting in the sanction of the representations of affusion in this picture. Justin Martyr (110-165), in chapter lxii of his *Apology*, referring to the imitation of Christian baptism by demons, says, "And the devils, indeed, having heard this washing [baptism] published by the prophets, instigated those who enter their temples and are about to approach them with libations and burnt offerings also to sprinkle themselves; and they cause them also to wash themselves entirely as they depart [from the sacrifice] before they enter the shrines in which their images are set." The sprinkling and the washing are here given, as together constituting the imitation of baptism. We find in Tertullian † an allusion to sprinkling as a part of the ceremony. Speaking of the simplicity of the rite he says, "Without pomp, without any considerable novelty of preparation, finally, without expense, a man is dipped in water, and amid the utterance of a few words is sprinkled and then rises again, not much the cleaner." In chap. xii he remarks:

Others make the suggestion [forced enough, clearly] that the apostles then served the turn of baptism when, in their little ship, they were sprinkled and covered with the waves; that Peter himself also was immersed enough when he walked on the sea. It is, however, one thing, as I think, to be sprinkled or intercepted by the violence of the sea; another thing to be baptized in obedience to the discipline of religion.

* Justin Martyr: *Resp. ad Orthodox.* 137.

† *De Baptismo*, chap. ii.

In the first quotation we have dipping and sprinkling associated in the one rite. In the second passage we have the implication that sprinkling, as well as immersion, was esteemed baptism. No objection is urged against sprinkling as violating the idea of baptism, but against calling that sprinkling or immersion "baptism," which had not been undergone in obedience to the discipline of religion. We can read through the lines that to the outside world in the second century, in North Africa, sprinkling and immersion were supposed to be parts of the baptismal rite.

Once more, we may cite the conclusion of Cyprian (200-258) in his well-known *Epistle LXXV*:

Whence it appears that the sprinkling also of water prevails equally with the washing of salvation; and that when this is done in the Church, where the faith both of receiver and giver is sound, all things hold and may be consummated and perfected by the majesty of the Lord and by the truth of faith.

It is true that these words refer primarily to the baptism of the sick, but this conclusion of the African father came to have a wider application in the practice of the Church. Cyprian has never been forgiven by some for having made these sensible utterances.

Finally, let us turn to the earliest Church manual, the *Didache*, which may be assigned to the early part of the second century at least. In chapter vii we read:

Now concerning baptism, thus baptize ye: Having first uttered all these things, baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, in running water. But if thou hast not running water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water upon the head thrice, into the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit.

This writer knows nothing apparently about chrism. He does allow liberty in the mode of baptism. It is said that if the catacomb fresco teaches pouring it contradicts the *Teaching*, for this allows of pouring only where there is not sufficient water for an immersion; and furthermore it will be declared that, as the subject in the picture evidently stands in water, pouring would be superfluous and opposed to this

manual of instructions. It is hardly probable that the majority were baptized in "running water," or water brought from streams. Many were baptized in "other water;" many in water "warm" or "cold;" many were poured or sprinkled; but the aim of the catacomb artist was to represent a typical baptism in the time of Christ, which would be in the Jordan. He undoubtedly combined in the picture the local custom of pouring or sprinkling along with the immersion. In interpreting the picture these considerations must be taken into account. Early Christian literature indicates that a large liberty was allowed in the mode of baptism. This liberty has manifested itself in the practice of the Churches. While the Greek Church adhered to trine immersion with great tenacity and to-day practices this mode in all its chief churches, the Coptic and Armenian Churches have recognized the validity of trine aspersion from the earliest period in their history. De Rossi is of the opinion that the performance of the rite of pouring was by no means exceptional in the early Church, and that the catacombs agree with the oldest forms in this matter, as given in the *Didache*. He also maintains that the normal baptism was performed in the early Church by a mode which united immersion and affusion in a single rite, making them separate parts of a repeated ritual.*

Yet, even if we admit that Christian art does represent the act of chrism, there is very clear evidence that the chrism itself may have sometimes been administered with water in the place of the ointment. We have no less an authority than the *Apostolic Constitutions* for this statement. In Book VII, chapter xxii, we read the following concerning the ceremony of baptism:

But thou shalt beforehand anoint the person with the holy oil and afterward baptize with the water, and in conclusion shalt seal him with the ointment that the anointing with the oil may be the participation of the Holy Spirit, and the water the symbol of the death (of Christ), and the ointment the seal of the covenant. But if there be neither oil nor ointment, water is sufficient for the anointing and for the seal.

It is the opinion of Harnack and others that this part of the *Constitutions*, evidently based upon the *Didache*, belongs to

* Bennett: *Christian Archaeology*. Revised ed., p. 453.

the second century.* The liberty allowed certainly recalls the *Didache*. This leads us to the conclusion that chrism was not inevitably performed with ointment. That it was sometimes administered with water is evident. What becomes now of the statement that Christian art never represents the pouring of water in baptism? Even those who hold that chrism is always indicated must acknowledge that water was used. Therefore the representations in Christian art which show the ministrant pouring water on the head of the subject are not contradictory to Christian literature, but are in perfect harmony with it.

* *Texte und Untersuchungen*, II, 246-248.

Amos W. Patten

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

PROFESSOR BARRETT WENDELL, of Harvard, says that "New England developed the most mature school of pure letters which has yet appeared in this country;" and speaks of Emerson as "a writer of unconditioned freedom whose work bids fair to disregard the passing of time, its spirit seeming little more conditioned by the circumstances of nineteenth century Concord or Boston than Homer's was by the old Ægean breezes."

"EACH succeeding generation," wrote Goethe, "will renew its youth in the Bible, and the standard for the life and power of a people will be the measure of that people's faithfulness to the precepts of the Bible. Let mental culture increase and science spread and deepen; let the spirit of man broaden as it will—the majesty and the morality of Christianity as it shines forth in the gospels will never be surpassed." Nothing that the great German ever wrote is more manifestly true than this.

A PROMINENT American Catholic clergyman, an astute Jesuit, said one day in Porto Rico, in a moment of candor, in conversation with a Protestant, that it was a good thing for the Porto Ricans that the Spanish priests went home to Spain when the Spanish government officials left the island. And the American priest added, "What Porto Rico needs now is a good batch of Methodist preachers." This is as true of the Philippines as of Porto Rico.

In his *History of the Religious Sentiment Among the Ancient Romans*, Professor Zeller says that the sentiment of awe in the presence of the forest was the only religious sentiment the ancient Romans ever developed. It is a tremendous straining, if not an utter perversion, of language to call that instinctive feeling a religious sentiment. It unfolded, to be sure, in the time of the Roman empire, into the rankest growth of superstitions that the human imagination has ever produced; but surely forest-

awe never carried any man or nation far on the road toward real religion.

IN *Alice of Old Vincennes*, Maurice Thompson, who was a minister's son, wrote :

The Church, no matter by what name it goes, has a saving hold on the deepest inner being of its adherents. No grip is so hard to shake off as that of early religious convictions, the still, small voice, coming down from the times "When shepherds watched their flocks by night" in old Judea, passes through the priest, the minister, the teacher; it echoes in cathedral, church, open-air meeting; it gently and mysteriously imparts to human life the distinctive quality which is the exponent of Christian civilization. Upon the receptive nature of children it makes an impress that forever afterward exhales a fragrance and irradiates a glory for the saving of the nations.

ONCE, when Adam Clarke was trying to steer between opposing parties under criticism, John Wesley wrote him :

Dear Adam : You will want constant supplies of courage and prudence. Very gently and very steadily you should proceed between the rocks on either hand. In the great revival in London my first difficulty was to bring into the proper temper those who opposed the work; and my next was to check and regulate the extravagancies of those who promoted it; and this was by far the hardest part of the work, for many of them would bear no check at all. But I followed one rule, though with calmness; either to bend them or break them. When you act rightly, expect to be blamed by both sides.

Every man who is charged with duties of supervision, direction, and administration must have firmness enough to go steadily forward through criticism and blame, sometimes roughly and severely expressed.

At a Missionary Parliament, in the north of England, early in the present year, one question for discussion was why foreign missions are not more adequately supported by the English people. Mr. F. W. Harrison, a representative of the London Press Association, presented opinions from a number of eminent men, among whom were Dr. Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, whose chaplain wrote from Lambeth Palace, January 15, 1901 : "I am desired by the Archbishop of Canterbury to say that he knows of no reason why foreign missionary work does not receive more sympathy, except the slowness of Englishmen to take up any work whatever save that by which money can be made." Is not this the same as saying that they are not truly Christian? Christ's call is for men to do from pure love of God and man what worldly and unregenerate men will only do for money.

THE SUICIDE OF GOD.

IN the late seventies of the last century seven Japanese boys, schoolmates in a government college in one of the cities of Japan, having been converted to Christianity under the labors of Methodist missionaries, formed themselves into a society which they called a Church. In that small membership, we are told, were seven different types of mind. It does not require a large number of human beings to insure variety. Two have been known to furnish not only variety but virulent contrariety.

Of one of the seven members the following account is given. He was physically nearsighted, perhaps also mentally myopic, and suffered from neuralgia. What seemed reasonable to others often looked unreasonable to him. He was so constituted that he must question everything, and prove things before he could accept them. The name of this suspicious and distrustful lad should have been Thomas, though it was not. With all his scholarly airs and spectacles and doubts, he is said to have been a guileless and gentle-hearted boy. But he often perplexed the mind and cooled the enthusiasm of the incipient Church with his gloomy and seemingly captious skepticism about Divine providence and other momentous matters. In his unhealthy, neuralgic head he manufactured more puzzles and heresies than he or anybody else in that vicinity could dispose of. One of his heterodoxies rose from misreading that mysterious chapter, the ninth of Romans, through spectacles smoked black and blue by hyper-Calvinistic exegesis, which led him to this conclusion, explicitly announced, "If God made one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor, there is no use in trying to be saved; for He will take care of His own, and we shall be saved or damned in accordance with His inscrutable and unalterable decree, notwithstanding all our efforts to be otherwise." A strange, immoral, sacrilegious heresy, indeed, to be adopted and propounded by a Methodist convert!

In view of the multiplicity, gravity, pertinacity, volubility and disturbing effect of his heresies, it was finally deemed best to make a concerted and strenuous effort to settle some of these vexatious and insurgent questions, and silence this troubler of the little Israel; and, to this end, the young Church turned itself temporarily into a theological debating society and focused its intellectual powers on the task of answering the doubter and extricating him from his gloomy conclusions.

The constitutional skeptic, thus formally put on the defensive and standing alone against the phalanx, perhaps with something of the feeling of *Athanasius contra mundum*, showed himself not less but rather more unreasonable, captious, and obstinate, taking a position on the far off-side of nearly every question, even on that of the existence of God. When anybody framed an affirmative proposition and punctuated it with a period at the end, he rubbed out the period and put an interrogation point in its place. The climax of wanton and obstreperous dissent was reached when the six orthodox affirmers had proceeded so far with the job of silencing the ingenious recalcitrant as to have proved, by arguments conclusive to themselves, that this universe must have had a Creator, and that the Creator must be self-existing, all-mighty, and all-wise. Then the nervous neuralgic, driven into a corner but determined not to surrender, contracted his spectacled brows and answered: "I grant that this is indubitably a created universe and that the Creator must have been all-wise and all-mighty, so that nothing could be impossible for Him. But how can you prove to me that this God, after He created this universe and stocked it with forces and set its processes in motion so that it can evolve and grow by itself with the potential energy originally imparted by Him—how can you prove that this Creator has not put an end to His own existence and annihilated Himself? If He can do all things, why can He not commit suicide?"

The incorrigible skeptic felt sure that he had plumped down a poser on the table of debate, and gazed around on his opponents with the air of one who does not know he is beaten. A painful silence fell for a moment on the astounded and non-plussed defenders of the Faith, who simply stared aghast. But in another moment one member of the little Church, who seems to have remembered the directions given for answering a certain class of persons in Prov. xxvi, 5, and who felt the wanton affront to sense and reason contained in the heretic's silly question, gathered his wits and indignantly blurted out the only answer fit and adequate to the occasion, "Well, only fools will ask such questions!"

The little church in Japan is not alone in its experience, and the suicide of God is not the only heresy, which, without any foundation in reason, has had behind it a morbid distrustfulness, a disputatious spirit, a perverse pride of opinion, a cantanker-

ous indocility, a pleasure in the apparent importance gained for oneself by conspicuous differing from the established consensus, and a propensity to worry the saints—one or all of these and similar constituent elements of the cerebral solution out of which multifarious and grotesque heresies crystallize. Indeed, as a general rule, the impeachments which assail the fundamentals of Religion are too frivolous and preposterous to be intellectually respectable.

PROFESSOR WINCHESTER ON THE GOLDEN AGE OF NEW ENGLAND LITERATURE.*

I AM sure there are men here who could speak with more intimate knowledge of the great New England writers than I can ; very possibly some of riper years whose good fortune it may have been to know some of them personally. I can only claim a long admiration for their work, and possibly some knowledge of that type of New England character and life which they all represent. For, although my parents removed from the town of my birth so early that I might almost say with the traditional Irishman that "I was never in my native place," they only removed from one New England town to another; I passed all my youth within less than a score of miles of that Burial Hill at Plymouth where rest the ashes of my maternal grandfather seven times removed; my earliest conceptions of the stir and bustle of the great world of men were drawn from visits in my childhood to that Mecca of every New England country lad, Boston—where my paternal ancestor landed two hundred and sixty-five years ago; I learned the dialect of Hosea Bigelow so early and so fatally well that—I dunno as I shall ever unlearn it now; and all the experiences and memories of my early days are bound up with that type of life in eastern New England which, in some respects so rugged and austere, is yet the soil out of which our noblest literature has grown. I say our noblest literature, because I suppose not even the critic most envious of New England would venture to deny that, in Emerson and Longfellow and Whittier and Holmes and Hawthorne and Lowell, our

* By solicitation we obtained this report of an after-dinner speech, essentially extemporaneous and not intended for publication, delivered by Professor C. T. Winchester at the annual banquet of the New England Society of Brooklyn, N. Y., on December 21, 1900. We present it as spoken, because it seems the more vivacious and effective in the free, off-hand informality of its utterance. For want of space elsewhere in this number of the *Review*, we insert it here. [Ed.]

American literature touched the highest excellence it has yet attained. Indeed, I am inclined to think that, without boastfulness, we can say more than that. We may admit that neither of these men, in the combination of those qualities which constitute greatness in literature, is quite the equal of two or three of his contemporaries in England; but I venture to think that not more than twice or thrice in the whole course of English literary history can you find a group of men, gathered about one literary center, bound together by intimate personal friendship, who have produced any body of writings that in freshness of imagination, in racy humor, in vigor of thought, and in power of moral impulse, is superior to that produced between 1845 and 1875 by those six men—Emerson, Longfellow, Whittier, Hawthorne, Lowell, Holmes. They are the leading figures in a school of writers that any country might well be proud of. With them America first gained a distinctive place in the literature of the world; we shall be fortunate if, in the next two generations, we produce, the country over, so large a body of writings so well deserving to live.

But it would be idle to speak any words of mere praise for these men; still less to attempt any critical estimate of their work. I wish rather simply to emphasize the fact—which we may certainly remember with pardonable pride on an occasion like this—that this is a New England literature. To say this implies much more than the mere accident of residence. These men, with the widest differences of individual genius and temperament, all have certain deep underlying similarities of character which are of their blood and inheritance. The history, the tradition, the temper, the very atmosphere of New England is in all their work. Every man of them, whether poet or philosopher, or humorist, or reformer, is first of all a Yankee. Their work cannot be conceived as produced in any other section of the country than New England, nor indeed in New England at any other period than during their generation. Doubtless this is to admit a certain provincial character in their work; and I am aware that some of our more cosmopolitan modern critics are inclined to regard this with a superior regret. But there are worse things than provincialism—in fact, I sometimes think there are not many things better. I like my literature not too far conventionalized—with some flavor of its native sources. At all events, I am sure that the freshest and

most original writers are oftenest those who can find both their motive and their circumstance in the life they ought to know best, the life of their own time and their own society. I suspect any society of being somehow oversophisticated and outworn when I find its writers going too far afield for their themes, or making—as so many of our writers of fiction nowadays do—labored “studies” of eccentric or unfamiliar phases of experience. Our New England writers were not provincial in any narrow or petty sense. Their outlook upon the great truths and the great passions was not narrowed; but they found those truths and passions right at home. In the history and legend of New England was room enough for all romance; in the life of New England, the same wisdom and pathos and inspiration that had made the literature of all the centuries. As Emerson makes old Monadnock say:

There's fruit upon my barren soil
Costlier far than wine or oil;
Autumn ripe, its juices hold
Sparta's stoutness, Bethlehem's heart,
Asia's rancor, Athens' art,
Slow-sure Britain's secular might,
And the German's inward sight.

When men come to see, as these men did, with a kind of glad surprise, that the richest harvests of imagination are to be garnered in the fields that spread around their own door, then you are pretty sure to get a genuinely national literature.

Up to about 1835 the best thought of our people had been given to practical and political matters. We were framing a government and making a society. Of statesmen there was no lack; there were no abler statesmen living than those who framed our Constitution and defended it in the earlier years. And of these, too, New England had furnished her quota. But now, for the first time, and in New England, there was leisure and stimulus for that larger, more contemplative, and imaginative view of life out of which literature must come. Our earlier attempts had been mostly imitative. The *North American Review* was a copy of the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly*, and written in their academic manner. The work of Irving was largely, that of Willis almost wholly, copied from the manner of the English essayists. But with the appearance of Emerson's first book, *Nature*, in 1836, and of *The Dial* four years later in 1840, we get something fresh, studied from no original, and inspired

immediately by a new sense of the possibilities of our own life. Says *The Dial*, in its second number: "We have our men of science, our Franklins, our Bowditches, our Cleavelands; we have our orators, our statesmen; but the American poet, the American thinker, is yet to come. Let us but have earnest, whole-hearted, heroic men, and we shall not want for literary fame. Then we shall see springing up in every part of these republics a literature such as the ages have not known—a literature commensurate with our ideas, vast as our destiny, and varied as our theme." If this prediction sounds somewhat large, its loftiness of moral ideal, its confidence in native resource, were certainly of the happiest augury for a new literature. That stir of thought in New England which we call somewhat vaguely the Transcendental Movement was doubtless only one wave of that greater impulse which in the thirties and forties was spreading over England—and indeed over the whole Continent; and which spoke with various voice in Richard Cobden, and Thomas Arnold, and John Henry Newman, and Thomas Carlyle, and John Ruskin, and Alfred Tennyson. But in England this movement was more distinctively one of reform and correction. It was the fever caused by the injection of new ideas, political, industrial, religious, into a system grown lethargic from custom and full of old abuse. There were Reform Bills to be passed, and Poor Laws and Corn Laws to be repealed; there were clamorous Chartists to be pacified or suppressed; there were starving thousands to be fed or colonized abroad in fatter lands. But here in New England there were no venerable wrongs to be righted, no crust of unrighteous custom to be broken up. The difference between the optimism of Emerson and the pessimism of Carlyle—which everybody has noticed—is not due entirely to difference of individual temperament; it is due in part to the different conditions in which the two men lived. For New England between 1830 and 1850 was a place of health and hope; an excellent place in which to grow a literature of sap and vigor. The earliest days of narrowness and isolation were past. The mind of New England had become hospitable to the best thought of every age and clime. We of this later generation can well believe that, as Lowell says, the Cambridge society of his time was the best society of the world. Yet it was still a comparatively simple society, homely, democratic, friendly to plain living and high

thinking. The population was still very homogeneous; there were no very wide differences of wealth or social standing, no hungry or complaining under class. There was general comfort without luxury. Most of the people still lived in the country or near it; you never got far away from the healthy smell of the soil. All the traditions of the section made for a certain plain, good-humored, sturdy independence. Now it was at the period when this New England character was to be seen in its purest, most distinctive form, that this group of writers began their work. There is in all their writing, not only the interest of new themes, but the vigorous originality of youth. Most of them have some of the faults of form that you expect in a new and untutored literature; Hawthorne is perhaps the only one in whom vigor of conception is matched with an almost faultless artistic sense. But they all bring to their subject a certain freshness and eagerness of mind. Read the essays or the verse of Emerson, and the old truths of human life, which sages have said and poets sung since time began, sound like new discoveries. You feel the confidence, the vision, the forward look of a new era.

Never did a literature show the very age and body of the time, his form and pressure, more faithfully than did this. Its themes, its ideals, its mode of thought, its imagery, its forms of speech—they are all of New England. Our very landscape is set in these men's page, with all its austere beauty, its wayward untamed charm—the dear old Yankee birds and flowers, and trees and hills and pastures. As I read I hear again, as all through my boyhood I heard, the purring of the pine trees behind my father's farm, that

Mope, an' sigh, an' sheer your feelin's so,—
They hesh the ground beneath so, tu, I swan,
You half-forgit you've gut a body on.

I see again the bobolink in my father's orchard, as

Half-hid in tip-top apple-blooms he swings,
Or climbs aginst the breeze with quiverin' wings,
Or, givin' way to 't in a mock despair,
Runs down, a brook o' laughter, thru the air.

And I am ready to agree with Hosea Bigelow, that

I'd give more for a live bobolink
Than a square mile o' larks in printer's ink.

In truth, I sometimes doubt whether you can find anywhere in Wordsworth or Scott or Tennyson the actual scene ren-

dered with such loving fidelity, such truth to its very atmosphere as in such passages as these from Lowell, or in Emerson's "Wood Notes," or "May Day," or in Whittier's "Snow-Bound;" while for the union of nicety of observation with poetic feeling, Thoreau's "Walden" is unsurpassed by any similar prose in the language. White's "Selborne" is meagre in comparison.

The dominant tone of feeling, too, in all this literature is very characteristic of New England. It is cool, self-controlled, with a trace of sternness. New England affections are deep, but shy and reticent. You see the inherited Puritan austerity and reserve. In the books of these men there is a high chasteness and purity of feeling; passion, but the passion of the spirit, not of the flesh; no soft luxuriance of manner, no dallying with delights of sense; no hectic or fevered love of beauty; no trace of that disordered sensibility and neurotic temper which taints so much modern writing. This literature is as healthy as the winds that blow around the granite hills of New Hampshire, or the piney breath of the woods of Maine.

Consider, also, how typical of the New England character is the humor of these men. It is of the very essence of humor, I suppose, that it cannot be accurately described; but we may all recognize some distinguishing qualities of the humor of New England. It is a good humor—never bitter or sour; I don't think we have had a New England cynic. Nor is it hilarious, Rabelaisian, or farcical. Your New England humorist never wears the cap and bells. He seldom laughs aloud; but he meets extravagance or sentiment with a look of droll incredulity. He has a certain dry shrewdness, and he will give a homely turn to the sublimest truths. His humor almost always has a moral basis, and seems to consist in some odd contrast between the commonplace and the lofty. "Hitch your wagon to a star!" Who can imagine that said by anyone outside of New England? And is it humorous or is it sublime? You hardly know, for humor of this sort in truth passes insensibly into all forms of serious feeling. Take as an example Lowell's "Bigelow Papers." So far as I can recollect, they are something unique in English poetry. The combination of such a variety of high poetic qualities in a humorous poem is unprecedented. Yet the combination does not seem forced. The exquisite description, bright imagination, delicate sensibility, intense pathos, stirring lyric appeal, are suffused in every line with a humor

which serves to heighten the passion and the beauty of the whole. Many a man cannot read or remember to-day some of those stanzas without feeling again the thrill of solemn assent with which, though only a boy, he read them first:

God means to make this land, John,
Clear thru, from sea to sea,
Believe an' understand, John,
The wuth o' bein' free.
Ole Uncle S., sez he, I guess,
God's price is high, sez he;
But nothin' else than wut he sells
Wears long, and thet J. B.
May larn, like you an' me.

This is the type of humor—varying, of course, with the person and the theme—but always serious, moral, the other face of earnestness, that you will find in all these men—Holmes, Hawthorne, Emerson, and even in Whittier and Longfellow.

And then this literature is typical of New England in that it is so thoroughly democratic. English fiction and poetry in the last century tended to patronize the people, and Wordsworth, at the beginning of our century, in his idealizing of wagoners and peddlers perhaps rather overdid it. But all such writings emphasizes the difference between social classes. In our New England writers, on the other hand, you do not find any sense of social distinction. There are no classes in their work. One of the latest historians of American literature rather amuses me by the pains he takes to prove that our New England writers came of families of excellent blood and breeding; the writers themselves never show any fussy solicitude on that point. All of them, excepting perhaps Whittier, did doubtless belong to families of comfortable wealth and of the best culture of the town. Yet they do not seem to be aware of any distinction between themselves and other people. Some of Lowell's English friends supposed that the dialect of Hosea Bigelow was that of Lowell's father and family circle. Of course it was not, but it was a speech that Lowell knew as well as he knew his mother's tongue and heard every day. It was not the speech of a peasant class elaborately represented. Parson Wilbur and Hosea Bigelow belong to the same social class, and the other name of both is Lowell. And these writers shared all the activities of their fellow-citizens. Emerson never missed his town meeting, and was once, I believe, honored with an election to the position of hog-reeve of the town of Concord

—and accepted it too. The truth is there never was a society that while making room for differences of wealth and culture and intelligence, was more generally democratic, more entirely without any hard lines of caste distinction, than the society of New England from 1830 to 1850. I think the best picture of a healthy democracy that can be found in literature can be found in the works of our New England men, and I am sure that the best defense of democracy that I know of is in Mr. Lowell's famous Manchester Address. It is true that it was comparatively easy then to believe in democracy. The problems of modern society had not yet arrived in New England when Lowell and Emerson and Hawthorne were writing. Life, as one looks back upon it, seems almost ideally strong and simple.

But most of all I hold this literature to be typical of New England in its moral quality. The moral note is dominant in every one of these writers from first to last. Their work was never merely literary, never shut up within the horizon of æsthetic interest. It all has a distinctly ethical motive. It takes a moral impulse of some sort to set the imagination at work. In the case of reformers, in men like Whittier, that goes without saying. Emerson was first of all, not the poet, not the essayist or critic, but the preacher. Some of us were inclined to resent a little Mr. Arnold's patronizing tone in his lecture upon Emerson, yet I believe Mr. Arnold was right in his opinion that Emerson was first of all a guide and helper of those who would live in the spirit. Every one of Hawthorne's tales, and even his novels, is built up about a moral conception. Lowell said, "I shall never be a poet until I get out of the pulpit, and New England was all meetinghouse when I was growing up." Even the most scholarly and academic of the group—Longfellow—exerted his best and deepest influence by his power of moral stimulus. His biographer says of "The Psalm of Life" that young men found their hearts stirred by it as though by a bugle summons. It inspired and enriched their lives. The same was true of most of his earlier and most popular writing. So Holmes in his charming papers is not concerned primarily with merely literary, artistic, or æsthetic matters, but underneath all the delightful humor is a genuine and aggressive moral earnestness. All these men derived from Puritan ancestry. They are of the school of Wither and Marvel and Milton. The training of five generations, the culture and learning of modern life, had

taken all Puritan acerbity and narrowness out of them. Their thought was thoroughly liberated; and yet the aggressive moral temper of the Puritan was in the blood of all of them.

Such, as I conceive them, are some of the characteristics of the only distinctive school of American literature we have as yet produced. We may have something greater in the future; but we shall have nothing exactly like it. For we no longer have such a New England. We have more learning in New England now, perhaps, more wealth, more enterprise; but the old simple, homogeneous society, with its directness of aims, its unity of feeling, that we have no longer. A good many people who belonged in New England have moved away to civilize the outlying districts, and their place has been taken very largely by immigrants of alien race and temper. Much of the interest of Mr. Lowell's admirable work proceeds from the fact that it was a picture of some phases of New England society in the period of its transition from the old times to the new. Nowadays, people who write of New England life are prone to go into the country a good ways, or into the past, and picture some quaint belated types as curious or picturesque; but they do not give us, as those greater writers did, the life of to-day, the life of which they are themselves a part. And I do not find in the literature of the present day any such earnestness of moral conviction and such sense of a message as I do in our earlier New England men. Not until we *do* have again some writers who have something that they *must* say, who look upon literature as something more than a pretty art or elegant recreation, shall we have any literature to match this of the New England men. I expect that greater literature before the end of another century. The very multiplicity and difficulty of the problems that are upon us may delay for a little this expression of our modern life; but the writers will arise who shall be able to set this complex life in the forms of imagination, and to touch those deep moral motives upon which we must more and more depend for the solution of all its problems. But whatever the twentieth century may bring forth, it will be the verdict of all the future that the one eminent and distinctive school of American literature in the nineteenth century was produced in New England, was the expression of the New England character in its purest form, and was represented by Emerson, Whittier, Hawthorne, by Lowell, Longfellow, Holmes.

THE ARENA.

"THE RELIGION OF CHILDHOOD"—W. R. GOODWIN'S CRITICISM.

IF the "Arena" will tolerate a three-cornered discussion of this subject, I would like to "shy my castor into the ring." And in doing so I do not in the least assume that Dr. Story needs any help from me for the vindication of his article published in the *Review* for July, 1900, as against the criticisms of Dr. Goodwin in the "Arena" for the current March. If it will tend to make Dr. Goodwin feel pleasant, I shall be glad to say to him, and in the presence of all the readers of the *Review*, that I fully agree with him in so far as he agrees with Dr. Story. But with equal emphasis, and with a purpose not less to promote good feeling, I want to say that, when the doctor came to points where he dissents, it is to be regretted he did not conduct his case on its merits, instead of importing into the controversy the authority of such great names as Fletcher, Wesley, Ames, and Simpson. The latter is not fair, unless one is willing to let authority determine in all cases, which surely Dr. Goodwin would not be; because Mr. Wesley, for instance, believed in witches and put belief in witches and belief in the Bible into the same boat, to sink or swim together. No, unless a man is willing to bear a permanent "extinguisher of thought on his intellect," he cannot do that. In this world of progress the greatest authorities should be living, and the fact that a man is dead should not count.

But now for the real point at issue. The last half of Dr. Goodwin's closing sentence is as follows, "But the line of the new birth must be crossed by every child before he can become the child of God." Now, certainly, that is not what Jesus taught. What he did teach was that they were to come to him, because "of such is the kingdom of heaven," and that men were to "be converted, and become as little children"—not as little children are after they have crossed some line or other. But, now, Dr. Goodwin has to have this "line of the new birth" crossed by children, because he has previously assumed "the fact that we inherited from sinful Adam a tendency to sin," and that, therefore, "the blood of Jesus must cleanse the child from this inherited tendency." But what if this "inherited tendency" be altogether a natural tendency, and not at all a moral one? What if it be the law in the members, according to Paul, or, "the brute inheritance in man," according to evolution—the almost irrepressible physical, not yet completely dominated by the intellectual and the moral?

Such a view voids many difficulties. It is a view that is on the plane of the natural, and the natural must be heard here. For, surely, no one can have thought of this subject seriously who has not seen the difficulty of assuming an inheritance to sin from Adam. Because, if such were the fact, it must be for the reason that there is a law of our

being in virtue of which children in all cases inherit evil tendencies from their parents. That being so, it is a very mild case of inherited evil tendency that the race has from Adam, in comparison with the evil tendency which everyone now coming into the world inherits from the race. Did Dr. Goodwin ever stop to think that, to go back for only thirty-one generations, less than one thousand years, his progenitors—men and women—would number more than all the people now living in the world? If the sin of one man could put the whole race into a lost condition, surely the sins of the race should submerge the individual under a flood of evil tendency beyond hope of salvation.

The great need of the hour is to get rid of every vestige of Calvinism. Our Arminianism, until quite recently, has been more Calvinistic than we knew. There can be no clear thinking for us upon lines of anthropology and soteriology until this most horrid system of thought shall find no longer any function in the matter of vindicating "the ways of God to man." I take these truths to be self-evident:

1. That no man is a sinner except the man who has sinned. That sends out to the theological scrap pile,

In Adam's fall
We sinned all.

2. That no man is corrupt except the man who has corrupted himself. That would send out to the same pile,

Sprung from the man whose guilty fall
Corrupts his race, and taints all.

3. That no man can be righteous except he who "doeth righteousness." This makes man's salvation a real thing, and not a fiction.

4. That no man can be put in moral peril by having charged up to him an evil inheritance through the fault of another. That would make our religion ethical—he should no longer be "throwing things above which are wrong here below."

5. The child, being not in peril from the wrong of another, and having done no sin itself, is "of the kingdom of heaven" already. That recognizes relations as they are, and gives us a God whom we can worship, which, indeed, is a great necessity.

These five statements, all of which I verily believe to be true, have proved to me to be a very snug little theological kit—one which I can take with me to church, on the railroad train, and wherever I go. I hope it may be to others what it has been to me—a help to feel that there is a goodness in God's justice, as well as a "wideness in his mercy."

Minneapolis, Minn.

J. F. CHAFFEE.

A WORD FOR LUCIAN.

THE very interesting article by Professor Taylor, of Boston University, in the *Review* for September, 1900, on Lucian's attitude toward Christianity calls for some additional statement. It was hardly fair to use

the *Philopatriis* to make out a case against Lucian, and then to throw doubt upon the Lucianic authorship of the piece. In reality it bears no testimony whatever as to what Lucian thought of Christianity. J. M. Gesner, in a work published at Göttingen in 1730, *De Philopatride Luciano Dialogo Dissertatio*, definitely relieved Lucian of all responsibility as the author, upon internal evidence (compare also Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lexicon*, s. v. Gesner). A. S. Farrar says, "The work hardly merits an analysis." No fair-minded writer could so estimate a work undoubtedly written by Lucian.

A distinction should be made between the genuine works of Lucian and those not genuine. Not all that is bound in with Lucian is of Lucian. A careful study of the works undoubtedly written by the author in question has led the present writer to two conclusions:

1. Lucian requires no more expurgation for modern readers than Shakespeare or Dean Swift. What is more to the point is that there is in him none of that reveling in impure imagery which we find in the great English satirist. There was no bitterness in his hatred of shams, no personal animus in his criticism of the ways of men. He is sane and hopeful to the end. As to his personal attitude to the Christian faith and creed, both he and Swift lived within the Christian era; but, though Swift lived and died within the fold of the Church and Lucian without that fold, as far as works of righteousness are concerned, in any comparison, one will not suffer more than the other. His authentic references to the Christians are not necessarily antagonistic. In the *Alexander*, the *False Prophet*, he classes Christians and Epicureans together. But it was as enemies of the false, sensual imposition which Alexander, who is an historical character, had practiced upon the credulity of the people of Pontus. One who will read the *Alexander* will not censure an alliance in a cause so good. It makes one think there must have been some elements of good even in Epicureans. The *Proteus*, Lucian's chief offense, is probably a delineation of some actual impostor. One may learn from Rev. ii, 2, that there were such.

2. As a literary interpreter of the life of men in the subapostolic age Lucian has no peer, and scarcely a rival. By cosmopolitanism he outshines any Greek or Roman of the first two Christian centuries. He pictures for us men and women in all the common walks of life. I will venture to say that upon no other pages than those of Lucian shall we find so varied and sympathetic a picture of the multitude which the Christian Church sought after in the era of her early triumphs. The *Dialogues of the Courtesans* is no *Decameron*, but the story of the intensely human experiences of an unfortunate class of women. In Acts xvii, 18, certain Epicurean and Stoic philosophers ask, of Paul, "What would this babbler say?" (this "*σπερμολόγος*," this "picker up of seeds"). We do not find this word in the text of Lucian; but it is an echo of the furious logomachies described in Lucian's *Eunuch* or *Zeus the Tragedian*. What Paul thought of such a waste of useful energy he makes plain in

2 Tim. ii, 14, "charging them in the sight of the Lord, that they strive not about words, to no profit, to the subverting of them that hear."

In the *Hermotimus* we have the story of Lucian's life, singularly like the experience of Justin Martyr, up to the point where the latter met the guide who turned him to Christ. Surely we may not lay it to Lucian's charge that we cannot tell whether or not any such kindly messenger ever met him. He compels the belief that he was one of, at least, the better spirits of his age, and that he did set himself in a sincere way of his own against the evil he found in the world.

Portland, Conn.

WESLEY WOOD SMITH.

"WHAT CREATED GOD?"

THERE is an excellent article in the January number of the *Review* under the title, "Some Questions that Evolution Does Not Answer." On page 35 the inquiry is asked, "What Created God?" the treatment of the point being very unsatisfactory. We recall that Joseph Cook in one of his lectures touches on the same point, and leaves the question in about the same condition, quoting the answer of some one who replied to substantially the same quibble, "If my argument proves the existence of an infinite number of Gods, so much the worse for you."

It is a question long ago injected into the inquiry after the "first cause." However, the question is sprung too late, when the first cause is announced, that is, logically discerned. There the mind rests; there can be no "infinite series." The series which the seeker followed proved to be finite; and it led him, not to an infinite series, but to an infinite God, who is the only cause of the finite series.

We reach a similar result from the view point of the dependence of the material universe. It is dependent. We gather our perception of this condition of all finite things into the term, "the dependent." The idea expressed by this term comes clearly before the mind; but with it merges also another idea equally clear, the idea of "the independent." Each is as distinct and authoritative as the other. Both are axiomatic. In each case a something real corresponds to the idea. Back of the idea of the dependent is all the universe of finite things. They exist. Only the insane doubt their realness. Back of the idea of the independent is a Being measuring up fully to the mind's conception of it. The existence is real. A healthy mind does not doubt its realness any more than it doubts the validity of the axioms of science.

The independent is necessarily uncreated and eternal. Of it we may affirm all the attributes of the Deity; for they are "clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal powers and Godhead." Paul was not ranting. There is but one Independent. There can be no other. Incomprehensible? Yes. The mountain reaches far above the clouds; but we see it resting on its stupendous base, and, assured that the top is in the sunlight, our logic is satisfied.

Burlingame, Kan.

R. E. McBRIDE.

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.**THE PRESERVATION OF INTELLECTUAL VIGOR IN THE PULPIT.**

IN order to intellectual force in the pulpit there must be a corresponding vigor out of it. A preacher whose mind has become inactive will soon show to others in his public address that it is impaired. Inaction in any organ, whether physical or intellectual, tends to deterioration and decay. This law, so well understood in worldly matters, should not be lost sight of by the preacher. Rev. Mr. A., for instance, was once a powerful preacher; but after a time people wonder why he is no longer so, although he is yet in the prime of his physical vigor. He himself is surprised at the apparent change in appreciation of his public administrations. The same sermon which years ago aroused sinners and encouraged saints falls upon listless ears. But the reason, which perhaps he does not suspect, is that the intellectual and spiritual energy which accompanied the first delivery of the discourse has departed. The words are the same, but the flash and life have gone. His intellect has not been kept awake. His mental powers are dulled by disuse, and hence the first effect cannot be expected to follow his public efforts. Mere words are destitute of power. The life must be in them, and there can be no power even in delivery when intellectual vigor has departed. The people demand genuine life—not the vigor of noise or bluster, but the deep-seated energy which is apparent even when most quietly expressed.

The preacher may well inquire, then, how intellectual vigor is to be preserved. It cannot be maintained unless the mind is kept active. Any organ of our bodies deteriorates by disuse. Movement is the law of progress. The repetition of a sermon, if the minister has simply memorized it, does not call forth intellectual energy, and hence its powerlessness. This does not lie so forcibly against those repeating the same discourse substantially, if they accompany the delivery with fresh thinking and fresh feeling. It is not necessary that one's activities be always employed in the same direction; indeed, it is best that he vary the form, both of intellectual production and of thinking. He even gains by those studies which call forth the reasoning faculties when no positive point is to be proved or enforced. This is true of the study of mathematics. It is well known that the reading over of a few geometric problems or the careful analysis of some argument on any subject prepares the mind for effective service in any practical line which is under consideration. The hands and the feet, unemployed, become weak and powerless; the mind, unemployed, loses vigor. Hence, it must be kept wide-awake by all the processes which are calculated to develop and strengthen it, and among these use is a prime factor.

Intellectual vigor may further be preserved by discovery—that is, the

constantly ascertaining of some new fact or truth and its presentation in fresh forms. The mind is in its very nature desirous of ascertaining things hitherto hidden from it. A new truth or principle or a new fact multiplies, so to speak, intellectual ability, as well as knowledge. Staleness of thought is a vice which should be avoided, and this can be best accomplished by constant interest in what is going on in the world and by grasping new thought with the intensity with which the miser grasps a new coin. Especially is this the case in the study of the Scriptures. The preacher is to bring out of the treasure house of sacred truths things old and new. There are fresh thoughts ever coming to his notice. There are new interpretations of words, fresh analyses of sentences, new forms of expression which constantly call forth intellectual effort. If one could gain a knowledge of all truth without effort, it would be a misfortune. Vigor of intellect is closely connected with freshness of study and the recognition of having found something that one has not known before which is calculated to impress others. New books, fresh and striking articles on important subjects preserve intellectual vigor long after the physical powers have become weakened.

The same result may be secured through the stimulus following from the wide reading and the profound study of the great authors, whether new or old. Some have held that only old books, which have been tried and tested, should be read. This is a mistake. Great books are ever making their appearance; not frequently, it is true, but often enough to furnish something worthy of study and thought on the part of the preacher. Contact with great books is like contact with great master minds through personal communication. A book so far above one that it is necessary to put forth all one's mental energies to comprehend it is for this reason worthy of study, if it be on a matter of interest and importance. It is well understood that in all professions men preserve their strength by reading and rereading the great treatises. There are some books which have been nourishers of successive generations. Bacon will not die, nor Plato, nor Aristotle; they are ever fresh to the real student. The great theological works also afford such stimulus as we are now speaking of—the writings of Augustine and Calvin, of Wesley and Chrysostom—not to refer to those of modern times which are constantly within reach.

Intellectual vigor may also be preserved by care for physical health. "A sound mind in a sound body" is an all-important maxim. It is true that vigorous minds are often found resident in feeble bodies, but a healthy body is the best home in which a healthy intellect can live. Mental vigor, then, involves the preservation of one's health. Failing physical strength often causes the decadence of intellectual vigor, and in many cases it is a cause which the individual cannot remedy. On the other hand, careful attention to the laws of life and health will often preserve to old age a vigorous body, and thus aid in preserving for a long period a vigorous mind.

There is another mode of promoting intellectual vigor which must not be overlooked, namely, that of constantly keeping in view the greatness of the preacher's work. To lose a sense of the dignity of the ministerial profession tends to destroy intellectual energy. One will not pour forth his best powers for that which he thinks does not deserve them. The recognition of the magnitude of the preacher's calling is a stimulus sufficient to incite all the powers, intellectual, spiritual, and physical, with which he is endowed. If one should go to a small congregation and think, "Here is a place where I need not put forth my best efforts," he will soon lose interest and power; but if, on the other hand, he regards the smallest schoolhouse in which a few people congregate as a place where the learning of an Erasmus and the eloquence of a Chrysostom may find fitting scope he will grow, even in the apparently most insignificant field. In God's sight there are no poor appointments. Often the charge which we, in our blindness, regard as unworthy of us will be found to be deserving of higher talents perhaps than we possess. The constant recognition that every place to which God calls us is a great place and that every service we are called to render is a great service because it is for him will be an incentive sufficient to keep alive our intellectual powers when age has come upon us and our physical strength has become diminished.

It is sufficient, then, to say that it is within the power of everyone to maintain his intellectual vigor, if the proper means are used. If, with diligence and fidelity to duty, we live amid the grandeurs of our vocation and amid the intellectual productions of the mighty minds of the past and present; and if, at the same time, we keep close to God in our spiritual life, intellectual vigor may be maintained down to declining years.

THE HOMILETIC VALUE OF THE LATE REVISION—II. Rom. ii, 12, 13;
iii, 20.

A COMPARISON of these passages as found in the King James Version and the late Revision deserves consideration for exegetical and also for homiletical reasons. We have already spoken of the force of the presence or absence of the article. In the general usage of this epistle the word "law" with the article—namely, "the law"—refers to the Mosaic law; without the article, to law in general. Thus interpreted, the passage as it is rendered in the King James Version means that "as many as have sinned in the law"—that is, in the Mosaic law—"shall be judged by the law"—that is, by the Mosaic law; for "not the hearers of the law"—that is, the Mosaic law—"are just before God, but the doers of the law"—that is, the Mosaic law—"shall be justified." This version, therefore, clearly regards the apostle as having in view only the law as given in the Old Testament; whereas, the late Revision broadens the scope of the word "law" by speaking of law in general. Wherever there is

law there is judgment upon those who transgress it. In no case, whether in the revealed law of the Old Testament or in the law of nature, can the hearers of law be just before God. It is only doers of law who shall be justified. We cannot fail to notice here that the apostle is asserting a great principle—that all law, whether the revealed law through Moses, or law as written on the consciences of men, must be obeyed in order to secure acquittal and approval. There can be no exemptions from obligations to obedience, wherever there is a recognition of law. The text, however, does not assert whether there is justification by law or not, but only asserts a principle that they who can be justified by law must be doers of law and not hearers merely.

The paraphrase of this passage by Sanday brings out its general meaning: "Do not object that the Jew has a possession of privilege, which will exempt him from this judgment, while the Gentile has no law by which he can be judged. The Gentiles, it is true, have no law; but as they have sinned, so also will they be punished without one. The Jews live under a law, and by that law they will be judged, for it is not enough to hear it read in the synagogues—that does not make a man righteous before God. His verdict will pronounce righteous only those who have done what the Law commands." By "no law" we understand the author to mean "no law which the Jews regarded as law."

In the twentieth verse of the third chapter of Romans the apostle states a general conclusion. In the King James Version it is declared that "by the deeds of the law"—that is, the Mosaic law—"there shall no flesh be justified in his sight. for by the law"—that is, the Mosaic law—"is the knowledge of sin." The late Revision, however, has here an alternative reading. In the text there is placed the phrase, "because by the works of the law," but in the margin we read, "works of law," following strictly the Greek. Further, "for through the law cometh the knowledge of sin" is in the text; whereas, in the margin we read, "through law." It would seem difficult to affirm that a knowledge of sin comes through the medium of natural law. Naturally it is supposed that any violation of the law which was revealed through Moses would bring a knowledge of sin, but that there is nothing in law as it is revealed in nature to indicate that a violation of the same would bring a consciousness of sin. A reference, however, to the first chapter of Romans in the Revised Version will relieve our embarrassment. We are there told that "the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity; that they may be without excuse." Here it is evident that the invisible attributes of God have become manifest through creation, namely, his power and divinity—thus affording a basis for Paul's statement that law brings a consciousness of sin, inasmuch as this law of which he is speaking is a revelation of God's power and divinity. In either case God is revealed. In the one case he is revealed through the Old Testament revelation; in the other, in the natural world. The violation,

therefore, of either law should bring a sense of sin and of consequent condemnation, and constitutes men inexcusable in his sight. Upon this point Shedd has said: "An unwritten revelation of the supreme Being himself involves an unwritten revelation of his law. The law of conscience compared with the written law differs from and is inferior to it in the following respects: 1. It is less specific; 2. It is more exposed to honest doubts in particular cases; 3. It is more liable to corruption and alteration; 4. Its sanctions are less explicit. Notwithstanding these deficiencies, however, the unwritten law is sufficiently clear to be transgressed, and sufficiently authoritative to constitute its transgression a sin."

For homiletical purposes these texts open to us great principles, namely: First, men are to be judged by the law which they have, no matter whether they have been favored with the revealed law, as was the case with God's ancient people, or whether they are dependent on the law of nature. In either case the law which they have constitutes the basis of approval or condemnation. Second, it is further affirmed that the possession of law does not constitute a ground of justification, but that the performance of its requirements is essential to legal justification. Doing, and not hearing only, is an absolute requirement. The possession of privileges, therefore, will not bring us to salvation, unless we ourselves make use of them. Third, obedience to the requirements of the law constitutes no ground of justification before God. The perfection of the divine law and the imperfection of our own nature are such, even under the gracious manifestations of God's love that absolute obedience to the divine law is impossible. We may have the spirit of obedience, but the fact of obedience in every detail is not such as to constitute it a ground of approval before God from any legal standpoint—though this does not imply that obedience to law could not justify, if such obedience were complete, but that "no man's obedience of the law is adequate to justify him." There can be no justification on this basis, as the language of the text indicates. Shedd remarks upon Rom. ii, 13: "There is no conflict here with the doctrine of justification by faith. The writer cites an axiom in ethics, namely, that personal obedience will be recognized and rewarded by that impartial Judge who is no respecter of persons, and that nothing short of this will be. That any man will actually appear before this tribunal with such an obedience is neither affirmed nor denied, in the mere statement of the principle. The solution of this question must be sought for elsewhere in the epistle." Fourth, the text further affirms the mission of law. It is to reveal to us a knowledge of sin. It shows us our own defects, our inconsistencies. It makes known to us clearly our transgressions of the holy law of a holy God, and that God cannot look upon sin with allowance, because it is antagonistic to his own holiness. Thus the text unfolds to us the helplessness through the medium of law to gain approval of God, and opens the way for the apostle's great discussion of salvation only by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH

CRETAN DISCOVERIES.

SEVERAL years ago Mr. Arthur J. Evans made some important discoveries in the island of Crete, and then announced that he had found on seal stones, on a libation table, and on some rocks marks which he believed to belong to some system of writing different from anything then known to the science of epigraphy. Encouraged by these discoveries, Mr. Evans has kept up his investigations in Crete since 1894, with satisfactory progress all along. But the result of this year's excavations has been very great, for, having obtained permission by the government and aided by the Cretan Exploration Fund, excavations were made at Cnossus, the capital of the island, where the early kings of Crete resided. Mr. Evans believes the ruins to have been those of the palace of Mycenaean kings of about 1400 B. C. The fresco and carving, though nearly three thousand years old, are exceedingly beautiful, superior to anything of the time yet found on the mainland of Greece. The royal bathroom is also quite unique.

But the style of architecture, with the loud testimony it bears to the advanced Cretan civilization, is eclipsed by the fact that a number of inscribed clay tablets have been found in the rooms already examined. What the rest of the ruins may produce can only be a matter of conjecture. These tablets resemble in shape those of Babylonia and Assyria; they are of different sizes, from two to seven inches long and from half to three inches in breadth. The script, however, is different from any system yet deciphered. These tablets prove conclusively that the Cretans possessed their own system of writing, at least six hundred years before the Phœnician alphabet had been introduced. "These inscriptions," says Mr. Evans, "are the work of practiced scribes, following conventional methods and arrangements, which point to long traditional usage. Yet this development has been arrived at on different lines; it is neither Babylonian nor Egyptian, neither Hittite nor Phœnician; it is the work on Cretan soil of an Ægean people." The discoverer is inclined to the belief that the tablets are palace accounts, and bases this opinion upon the fact that many of the forms and signs are repeated upon the various tablets. The more we explore, the clearer it becomes that there is no improbability that the Hebrew civilization suggested by the Pentateuch and early tradition was a reality. Indeed, explorers like Mr. Evans may yet restore Minos to us. What, after all, if Minos and Menes and Moses were historical characters?

More recently, in pursuance of his labors, other discoveries of unusual importance have been made by this veteran archaeologist, which many believe to be among the most remarkable and important finds of the age, and which will certainly furnish a new chapter, if not in the story of

European civilization, yet in the history of writing. Mr. Evans published his discoveries in recent numbers of the *Athenæum* (London). In these communications he very fully describes the work done by him and others in the island of Crete during the past season. The explorations were made in Cnossus, the capital of the earliest Cretan kings. The results, as gathered from this brief correspondence, have been eminently satisfactory—far beyond the most sanguine expectations of the promoters of the Cretan Exploration Fund. We are told that the closing days of the work were crowned with unparalleled success. For several chambers and corridors of the royal palace contained inscribed tablets, and one room especially, which was at the extreme end of a very long corridor, had no less than one thousand inscriptions much more perfect than anything found up to that time, “and not a scrap of anything later than the fourteenth century B. C.” The tablets have characters upon them, or, as Mr. Evans says, they are in a “linear and highly developed script,” with an occasional pictorial form. These tablets, like those of Babylon and Assyria, are of clay, varying in size from two to seven inches in length, and from a half to three inches broad. Most of them are ruled, some having no less than eighteen lines, though most only two. These latest discoveries will aid materially in tracing the development or evolution of the Cretan script, of which we now possess abundant material, and which may now be divided into at least three well-defined specimens: (1) The hieroglyphic, or pictorial; (2) the mixed, or a specimen between the pictorial and the linear; (3) the linear, or, shall we say, alphabetic?

The examples reproduced in the *Athenæum* are of great interest to the student of epigraphy, though, so far, not a line can be read. It is greatly to be hoped that further explorations will bring to light some bilingual or trilingual texts, and thus furnish the key which will unlock these secrets of the distant past. But, while this key is yet to be found, from the pictorial signs and some oft-repeated marks Mr. Evans thinks that many of the tablets have reference to the war department, while others are tax lists or government accounts.

Besides the tablets large numbers of other articles were found by Messrs. Evans and Hogarth on the Kephala site. Among these were some exquisite vases in stone and metal, rings, jewelry, statuettes, axes, knives, and other weapons. Nor must we forget to mention the magnificent fresco work, painted heads, and numerous terra cottas. Many of the objects are daintily decorated in various colors, as well as inscribed with characters like those on the tablets. The numerous articles impressed show that the Cretans were skillful in making seals and gems. Mr. Evans regards the life-size figure of a bull in *gesso duro* as “the finest piece of plastic work of the Mycenaean age yet discovered” and the frescoes as excelling all others painted at that time. The letter form of the inscriptions is also, in his judgment, unsurpassed by any form of later writing.

THE UNITED STATES AND ARCHEOLOGY.

WE have from time to time called attention to the interest of the American people in archaeological researches. This interest is constantly increasing, as is evidenced in various ways; and it is only a question of time before our larger cities and great universities will have museums of equal value and prominence with the best institutions of the kind in Europe. The large collections which have been brought to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and other cities are already not only attracting great attention, but are also proving very helpful to the student of ancient history. Professor Haupt, of Johns Hopkins, speaking on the subject has said, "If the plan can be carried out in the proper way we may be able to bring to this country a collection of Babylonian antiquities, elucidating the dawn of civilization and especially biblical archaeology, not inferior to the oriental treasures of the British Museum, the Louvre, or the Royal Museum of Berlin." The great work done in Babylonia by the University of Pennsylvania, under the direction of Professor Hilprecht and others, and the large number of archaeological objects secured by them for the museum at Philadelphia are too well known about to be repeated here. The readiness with which several American gentlemen have contributed of their means to facilitate exploration and excavation in Bible lands is also a matter of congratulation. Indeed, it is said that one of the richest men in the United States has encouraged a certain society to prosecute archaeological work in the mounds along the Euphrates regardless of expense. If this be true more antiquities may be expected during the next twenty years than have been yet discovered.

It is with great pleasure that we call attention to a new enterprise which its promoters call "A National Expedition, for the purpose of excavating the ruins of the traditional home of Abraham, Ur of the Chaldees." Ur, by common consent, is represented by several large mounds on the western side of the Euphrates, which the Arabs call "Mugheir." Though explorers have for the past fifty years devoted more or less attention to this ancient site, little or no scientific excavations have been made. Yet travelers and explorers who have visited these mounds report that inscribed articles and objects of great interest are lying on the very surface. This is partially explained by the fact that the natives have pulled down some of the ancient walls in order to obtain the bitumen or pitch which they find between the bricks or stones. Indeed, the word "Mughier" means "cemented with asphalt or bitumen." Professor Peters, in his *Nippur* (vol. ii, p. 300), says, "I have seen no mound which seems easier or safer to excavate, or promises greater results." When Mr. Taylor, British consul at Busreh, made some superficial excavations at this place, more than half a century ago, he succeeded in tracing the ruins of a huge temple of the Moon-God, "a perfect monument of Babylonian architecture," and from under the four corners of one of its towers brought to light four very fine cylinder-

inscriptions. He also found in an ancient grave in the same vicinity not only the skeleton of a man, but also several interesting articles, such as vessels in clay and in bronze, an inscribed seal, a band of pure gold nearly an inch in width, and several stones carved so as to represent different objects. This was more than fifty years ago, and yet, strange to say, mounds so rich in material and promising such large returns have remained practically untouched all these years.

The friends of this new enterprise, including some of the most learned men in the country, have selected Dr. Edgar James Banks, formerly United States consul at Bagdad, as the proper man to superintend the work. It is estimated that at least twelve thousand five hundred dollars will be needed to open up the work during the first year, the amount being used to pay the salaries of two Americans, a Turkish commissioner, an interpreter, and a force of one hundred Arab workmen. We shall await with eagerness for the results of this expedition, the more so since a very large number of the objects discovered are to be brought to the museums of this country.

AMERICAN SCHOOL AT JERUSALEM.

THE American School of Oriental Study and Research proposed for Palestine, though not yet largely endowed, is making such satisfactory progress that the managing committee, through its chairman, Professor Thayer, of Harvard, has offered a fellowship of \$500 for the year 1901-2. The candidates for this fellowship will be subjected to a competitive written examination, the results of which will in the main determine the successful candidate, though other qualities and "attainments on the part of the candidates will be taken into consideration." No one who has not a baccalaureate degree from some reputable college or university will be entitled to compete. Moreover, every applicant for this fellowship must have a fair knowledge of at least four languages, namely, Greek, Latin, German, and French. Besides these qualifications the candidate should have an elementary acquaintance with Hebrew, Syriac, and modern Arabic, as well as a general idea of the geography of the Holy Land and the topography of the leading cities, with some knowledge of the history of the country from the beginning to the present time. This is a move in the right direction, and it is a pity that every theological seminary is not able to offer one such fellowship every year, as it would encourage the very best talent in our schools to pursue archæological, historical, and kindred studies as nothing else could do.

We may also add that when this new school shall have been fully established great attention will be paid to explorations, and duly organized archæological trips under the guidance of competent instructors will be made into various parts of the Holy Land. The matriculates of this school are expected to have the degree of A.M. or B.D. from some recognized institution.

MISSIONARY REVIEW.

THE MISSIONARY AS A PACIFICATOR IN CHINA.

WHAT the future *status* of the missionary in China will be is, just now, a question on which no one seems to throw much light. The representatives of the allied powers have not yet attempted to grapple with the matter. In fact, they have not yet asked the Chinese authorities for any confession that they have done anything wrong in the disturbances of the year nineteen hundred, nor have they drawn from them any promise that the uprising may not be repeated at any hour hereafter; and, much less, have they come to any understanding among themselves as to how they will approach the missionary question, when the time for its consideration shall come. In short, they have as yet done little or nothing that looks to the pacification of the Chinese, except to seek to strike terror into them. This is all they have yet accomplished that tends to secure the freedom or the safety of foreigners, and it is to be doubted if this ameliorates the situation in the least.

It is uncertain if missions will be advanced to greater security for more than a brief period by alliance with these political forces, and it is possible that the only real pacification lies at last with the missionary himself. Strangely enough, this suggestion comes from a Buddhist source at this time. We have, for the first time in history, the remarkable instance of an appeal by Buddhists to the whole Christian world through the representatives of six principal Buddhist sects in Japan. While they leave diplomats to deal with the task of extricating the civilized powers from their present difficulty in China, they are frank to say that they are "fully convinced that the work of eradicating evil and consolidating the permanent peace and welfare of China must be placed in the hands of the propagandists of religion." They make handsome reference to Christian missionaries, saying that during the past ten centuries they have sailed to China, notwithstanding its great distance, and "with one heart exerted their energies for the propagation of their doctrine and the development of Christian civilization." As teachers of the Golden Rule they declare that "we, the followers of Buddha, cannot sufficiently express our sincere admiration for them." They are frank and generous enough to admit that, though the Japanese Buddhists have had a propaganda in China, they "have not yet been able to achieve anything worthy of notice, and are ashamed of their inability to follow in the steps of, and bring about the result secured by the occidental Churches in the middle kingdom." The missionary force in China may be gratified to have testimony from such a source that their work has been "absolutely indispensable for the development of civilization" in China, and that "the zeal and sincerity displayed by them are really extraordinary."

To accomplish the pacification of China by religious influences these Buddhists propose that there shall be less antagonism between religious representatives themselves, since all religions tend to conserve society, and since at bottom—as they see it—the higher classes of religion, while differing in tenets and rites, “are in all cases essentially, if not entirely, analogous,” since they “are based upon the principle of love for mankind.” This is a distinct proposition, in effect, that Buddhism and Christianity hold the key to the pacification of China, if they will only form a coalition—which from a Christian standpoint is impossible.

But the other proposition, while perhaps as nearly impracticable, is suggestive of a principle about the working of which the Christian missionary force is divided. These Buddhists particularly inveigh against the Roman Catholics for claiming an official *status* for certain missionaries in China, and for interfering between Christian converts and lawfully constituted Chinese officials. That these Roman Catholic missionaries will yield these privileges is not at all probable, since France has found in them a great means of power over the entire Chinese state, which she values perhaps equally with her possessions in Tonquin.

The only thing remaining which is worth debating refers to what these Buddhists think equally reprehensible and opposed to pacification, namely, the relations between the Protestant missionary and the consul. This has to do with territorial aggression as the Roman Catholic has to do with internal civil jurisdiction. Powers under pretense of exacting reparation for outrages against teachers of Christianity have impressed the Chinese that the missionary is a political pioneer, “followed by a consul with a general at his back ;” and “behind the man with a Bible in his hand stands a warrior armed with spear and sword.” It is natural, therefore, that these Buddhist representatives should entreat all Christian ecclesiastical authorities in the world “to exercise their interference to restrain the missionaries from proceedings likely to create suspicion of their secret connection with the foreign policy of their own countries,” in order that “the honest people of China may be induced to lay aside suspicion and apprehension, and to appreciate with delight the intrinsic virtues of religion.”

It is to be said that some Protestant missionaries have abstained wholly, and a still larger number almost wholly, from bringing their affairs to the attention of the consuls ; and many of them do not now desire that the allied powers shall do anything about the missionary question. Some of them believe an absolutely noncombative, if not politically a nonprotective, policy would put them at greater advantage to reach the Chinese, while others believe they would not have their heads on their shoulders an hour if the Chinese did not fear the political penalty. It seems quite certain that the missionary is, as the Buddhist priests say, in the possible attitude of a great pacificator, and should recognize the responsibility of the crisis. Rev. W. M. Upcraft, of China, inclines to favor the proposition of the allied representatives

that, as they cannot agree on points relating to the missionary question, they leave it out altogether, and thinks it better that "missions should not be explicitly connected with demands that must forever rankle in the minds of the most apathetic Chinamen."

RELIGION OF STUDENTS IN JAPAN.

An inquiry into the religious proclivities and tendencies of the young men of a nation, especially among those likely to become leaders, as represented by the students in higher educational institutions, would be interesting in any country. It becomes emphatically so when instituted in a land where a variety of religions exist and the population is in a state of religious transition, as is the case in Japan at present. Sixteen gentlemen of Japan somewhat recently addressed a series of questions to the students of the universities and higher schools in the empire which were designed to shed light on the religious conditions of the home, the school, and the changing phases of the thought of the times. These questions were as follows: "1. Do you believe in religion? Are you at liberty to believe it if you wish? 2. Have you any desire for religion? 3. Have you at any time believed in religion? If so, and you have relinquished that belief, state your reasons for this course. 4. If you believe in no religion, what do you depend on for regulating your daily conduct? Do you dislike religion? If so, why? 5. If you do not believe in religion yourself, do you recognize its necessity for others? If so, on what ground?"

Answers to such questions from university students might be supposed to indicate the maturer mind, yet conclusions of a satisfactory kind cannot be drawn from the replies, though they are thought-provoking. Such answers are, as a matter of fact, not complete enough to give assurance of a trend, and inferences may be made from them which would be very erroneous. In this instance over one third of those who replied concerning the religious influences to which they had been subjected in their homes acknowledged that friends and relations had made religious impressions upon them, though these were often of a very general character. Very few recognized any religious influence upon them made by the schools. Most of those admitting this had been in mission schools. The home religious influence of those from Buddhist families had been the highest; that of strictly Confucian homes the lowest, though possibly they were discriminating mentally between Confucianism as an ethical and a religious system. Some acknowledged that they had been prejudiced against religion by parents or guardians, but this most frequently meant against Christianity in particular. The anti-religious impressions received in the schools was attested to by about one in five of those who answered the inquiry. The confession that it is the superstitious element of religions which is most obnoxious is significant, as is also that of the prejudice received by the failure in the lives

of religious persons, and specially priests. Many of the students declared their prejudice against Christianity because they had been taught that it was injurious to the state. Nearly two fifths of the university students testified to having been religiously impressed by literature. Many expressions of belief were made that religion of some sort has been at the base of the convictions of the men who have accomplished great things in numerous instances. Others attributed their want of faith in religion to the reading of works of science; and still others to the reading of history, which showed them that many evils and wrongs were attributable to the religions of various lands and ages.

But the specially noteworthy answer was that two thirds of the whole believed in no religion whatever. The reason assigned by the major part of these for nonacceptance of, or nonbelief in, any religion was the hindrances or obstacles to their doing so. These were objections on the part of relations, intellectual doubts awakened by scientific research, or lack of time to maturely consider the subject. About one eighth of them acknowledged that they had no desire for religion of any kind; they objected to the thing itself. Of those acknowledging the necessity of recognizing some sort of ethical restraint, more than one half preferred to follow their own conscience rather than accept the ethical standards formulated by any of the religious systems. The trend of the answers as to the benefit of religion to society showed that those who replied considered religion rather a device than of value for its own merit.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

A WHOLLY new phase of the question of wealth is gradually pressing on the conscience of Christendom. The marked and marvelous combinations which increase the opportunity for the evangelization of the world, and also the slowly awaking sense of obligation among Christians to their corresponding duty, are now face to face with hitherto unimagined financial possibilities. The missionary openings demand money in what some would count fabulous sums. Thousands of men and women are ready to do or die, if they may push the kingdom of Christ to the ends of the earth. Nothing seems lacking to complete the coordination but an intelligent mastery of the new problem of the distribution of wealth. Dr. L. G. Powers, chief statistician of the government census, reports the wealth of this country alone at ninety thousand million dollars, the addition in the last decade being twenty-five thousand million—a saving within a decade equal to the aggregate savings of our people from the discovery of America to the civil war, and exceeding the savings of the world from the beginnings of history to the Declaration of American Independence in 1776. The new problem is to discover the law of distribution of surplus wealth. The grace of God is necessary to its solution, and the work of evangelizing the world must come into the count.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK.

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

Paul Feine. The Gospel as St. Paul understood and taught it continues to be a subject of investigation, particularly the question as to the course of the great apostle's own religious development, from which, in a considerable degree, it is supposed his doctrines sprang. Feine has given much study to this subject, the results of which he has embodied in a recent book, entitled *Das gesetzsfreie Evangelium des Paulus* (Paul's Doctrine of Gospel Freedom from the Law). Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1899. One of the first and most important questions Feine tries to answer is that concerning the religious consciousness of Paul prior to his conversion to Christianity. He reaches the conclusion that up to the time of his conversion Paul was through and through a Pharisee, in no wise influenced by Hellenism so far as his religious views were concerned. This he regards as well established by his reference to the Pharisaic conception of the Messiah found in 2 Cor. v, 16. But, as to the law, Feine thinks it certain that Paul was strictly a Pharisee prior to his conversion, and that he had looked with entire satisfaction, and even with pride, upon his zeal for the law and his righteousness under it, as Phil. iii, 6, seems to show. But by his conversion he came to see both the Messiah and the law from an entirely new standpoint, namely, that of Hellenic-Judaistic forms of thought, and reached the conclusion that his former views belonged to his period of unenlightenment. By the vision on the Damascus road the Messiah came to appear to him as not only risen and ascended, but also as spiritual, and no longer to be known or thought of in the flesh. It was also as a Christian that he came to think of the flesh as the seat of sin, and the law as the power by which sin was awakened and strengthened within man. His conversion carried with it the thought of Christianity as the universal religion. There is no evidence of a development in his Christian conception of the significance of the law. Gal. i, 10, and v, 11, do not imply that Paul had at one time in his Christian life entertained a more favorable view of circumcision. On the other hand, he felt, even before his conversion, that the standpoint of the primitive apostles was untenable. When he comes to the varied utterances of Paul with regard to the law Feine admits that the apostle's conceptions are not altogether harmonious. Paul estimates himself differently, according as he thinks of himself as fleshly or as dead to sin and the flesh through the spirit of Christ. Sometimes he thinks of the law, especially in its sublimated and spiritual aspects, as the standard, even for Christians. At other times he thinks of the Christian as in possession of the Spirit, and therewith of a standard which needs no complement in the law. A peculiarity of Feine's theory is that, since he makes conversion introduce

the sense of sin by means of a new conception of the law, he is compelled to view such a passage as Rom. vii, 14 ff., as belonging to Paul's Christian experience, and as a fair representation of what all Christians are likely to experience. This is, indeed, a conclusion which some modern exegetes are coming to, who proceed on a different theory from that of Feine. Whether Paul meant it to refer to his experience at any time subsequent to his conversion or not, it is certain that it describes phases of the experience of many other Christians.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

Die Bildung des Clerus in Kirchlichen Seminarien oder an Staatsuniversitäten. Historische Skizze eines hundertjährigen Kampfes in Deutschland (The Education of the Clergy in Seminaries of the Church Compared with their Education in State Universities. An Historical Sketch of a Century's Conflict in Germany). By J. B. Holzammer. Mayence, F. Kirchheim, 1900. The union of State and Church opens some problems in the education of the clergy which are practically unknown to us in America, where the State could not possibly undertake theological instruction. We take it for granted that our ministry must be educated at the expense of the Church. The most that can be done in our country is to attempt to make theological education undenominational, as at Harvard, though the agency of the State is universally excluded. In countries where Church and State are united it is to be expected that the State shall provide for theological, as for all other, education. To this only those Protestants need seriously object who feel that the State is out of sympathy with their particular sect or denomination. But Roman Catholics, by virtue of their theory that their Church is the only custodian of true doctrine, might, and many of them do, object to State education of the clergy. On the other hand, many Roman Catholics think that such education is not only an advantage to the Church, but really a necessity. Of course, these are of the class that recognize the danger to the Church arising from great restriction of thought. They realize that profound conviction can be produced only in those who have fought out the conflict of antagonistic faith and have reached a satisfying conclusion. This book of Holzammer's takes the other view. To its author the existence of the Church is dependent upon the right education of the clergy, and this can be secured only in Church seminaries. Among the greatest dangers to the Church from State university education of the clergy is the fact that the professors are officials of the State and hence cannot be deposed by the bishops, who are the proper representatives of the doctrinal authority of the Church. Another danger arises from the fact that at the universities the Roman Catholic students come into contact with students and professors of other communions, by whom of necessity they are more or less influenced. Strange as this seems to a Protestant, it is

the only logical standpoint for a Roman Catholic, who is supposed to believe that his Church is incapable of going astray or of missing any truth of God. A third danger arises from the temptations to vice which are inseparable from the ordinary university life in Germany. In contrast with all this our author points out that when the professors are practically chosen by the bishops the doctrines taught must be correct. For Methodists, at least, this is a strange doctrine; as though bishops were more likely to be orthodox and to have the truth than others. Such a view can be held only by those who believe in the Roman Catholic doctrine of the bishop as the depository of an unbroken tradition. We trust the small freedom enjoyed by Romanist professors of theology in German universities will not be taken from them.

Johann Tetzel, der Ablassprediger (John Tetzel, the Preacher of Indulgences). By Nikolaus Paulus. Mayence, F. Kirchheim, 1899. The intimate connection of Tetzel with the abuses which led Luther to begin his reformatory work will always give the notorious preacher of indulgences a position of great interest in the minds of all students of the Church history of the sixteenth century. It has become more and more a purpose on the part of Roman Catholic historians to rescue the name of Tetzel from the odium which attaches to it. This book by Paulus is written for that purpose. In order to this Paulus undertakes to show that Tetzel was neither as immoral nor as ignorant as he has generally had the reputation of being. But not even Roman Catholic skill in explaining away unfavorable testimony will suffice here, for the bad reputation of Tetzel does not rest on the assertion of Luther made in 1541, but on the letter of the papal nuncio, Karl von Miltitz, the brief of Pope Leo X to Luther, and the word of a loyal son of the Church, Johann Hass, Burgomaster of Gorlitz—all of which testimonies are unshaken and have the advantage of being contemporary with the exciting period when Tetzel was being most strongly condemned by Luther. But, in addition to this vain attempt to whiten the Ethiopian's skin, Paulus considers the teachings of Tetzel relative to indulgences. He tries to make it appear that that teaching can be discovered from three sources: (1) The so-called Frankfort theses, which, having been written by Wimpina and not by Tetzel, are no evidence as to Tetzel's doctrine; (2) the somewhat detailed official instructions according to which Tetzel ought to have proceeded in the sale of indulgences; and (3) certain sermons which possibly Tetzel left behind him. We think it very evident that none of these, nor all of them together, can be safely depended upon to reveal what Tetzel actually did. At most they exhibit the theory in its best form; and they cannot disprove the accusations which were made against him by both the friends and the foes of the Reformation. And Paulus himself confesses that, at least in substance, Tetzel taught that as soon as the indul-

gence fee rattled on the bottom of the money box the soul for which the indulgence was purchased sprang out of purgatory. Strangely enough, while Paulus tries to make that teaching unsound, from his own elaboration of the current instructions to sellers of indulgences it appears clear that Tetzel was well within his instructions when he so taught. For, according to Paulus, the instructions declared that if anyone wish to turn an indulgence to the account of one deceased, he need only perform the required external work, such as the payment of the money; it was not necessary that he himself be in a state of grace; and, further, as soon as the preceding conditions were fulfilled the indulgence became at once efficacious in all its extent, for the soul for whose benefit it was purchased. Paulus, so far from clearing Tetzel in this respect, has involved the Church in Tetzel's disgrace.

RELIGIOUS AND EDUCATIONAL.

The Baptists in Germany. Since the founding of the first Baptist congregation in Hamburg, in 1834, the growth has been so encouraging that in 1899 there were 8 associations, numbering 155 congregations, with 28,898 members. Including children and other unbaptized persons more or less closely related to the Church, they have a constituency of about 70,000 souls. They have property to the amount of 3,700,000 marks. There are 217 preachers and elders and 47 evangelists and col-porteurs, and the number baptized in 1899 was 1,763. The number excluded from the Church by disciplinary action was 624, which shows either that the discipline is exceedingly strict or that a very fickle class of the communities is reached. The net gain in membership during the year (1899) was 558, which is much below the average for the last ten years. The Sunday school work is effective. The number of Sunday schools is 417, with a total attendance of 18,237 members of classes. They have a missionary society, organized in 1891, with 9 self-supporting congregations and 53 mission stations, and 447 converts during 1899. The whole sum received for all purposes was 607,425 marks, or an average per member of something over twenty-one marks. They have a seminary in Hamburg for the training of preachers. The course of study extends through four years, and there are thirty-one students in attendance. From Germany the Baptists have spread into Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Russia, Roumania, and Australia.

The Sorrows of the French Secular Clergy. Many causes are mentioned as leading to the exodus of Roman Catholic priests from the Church in France. Among them a chief one is the position taken by the pope on all matters pertaining to modern progress. But those who are in a position to know the facts affirm that the one great cause is the deplorable condition of the priests. Prior to the Revolution there were 36,000 of the clergy whose positions were independent of episcopal appointment. Since the concordet of 1801 there

are but 3,425 of these, while 34,000 priests are subject to the caprices of the bishop for their positions. The support also is very meager, being 900 francs for those under, and 1,000 francs for those over, sixty years of age, until at seventy the priest receives 1,300 francs. The perquisites are seldom very valuable, and there is no provision for those priests who are disabled. But the principal source of the sorrows of the secular clergy is the growth in power of the religious orders, whose members are preferred as teachers, confessors, preachers, and pastors by high and low. In consequence, the secular clergy have become constantly poorer, and the orders richer. Their numbers increase with their wealth. In 1789 there were 60,000 members of the orders, male and female; in 1899 there were 160,000. Besides all this, in any conflict of interests between the orders and the secular clergy the authorities at Rome favor the former, even though all fully understand that the latter have right and justice on their side. Nothing but the profoundest conviction or the greatest indifference can hold the secular clergy of France in the Roman Catholic Church under these circumstances.

Shall Donations be Forbidden? Nothing less than this has been done in many parts of Germany, and in other parts the tendency is in that direction. The argument is that the clergy are brought into disrepute and contempt by these gifts. Everyone knows that, while they are often bestowed as tokens of the affection of the congregation, they are nevertheless intended to serve a less sentimental purpose, namely, to supplement the salary which is thereby confessed to be too small. Thus the pastor is made dependent upon the good will of the people for an honest and sufficient support. The effect is undoubtedly to belittle the pastorate into an institution that does not earn what is given and to reduce the pastor to an object of charity. On the other hand, say those who believe that donations should at least not be forbidden by law, these gifts afford an opportunity for the congregation to express its appreciation of a pastor whose services make him especially worthy. They claim that the association between pastor and people is not one of a strictly business nature, and that this tender and intimate relationship which the pastorate demands for its highest usefulness ought not to be interfered with by forbidding expressions of affection of a substantial kind on the part of the congregation. Still others argue that, if donations cease, taxes for the support of the ministry must increase. Probably all thoughtful pastors and laymen in our country have reflected on the evils and advantages of donations. The peculiarity in Germany is that the agitation is greater than the case warrants, and that the conservatives charge the liberals with being back of the abolition movement, thus making it a party question. As a matter of fact conservatives also believe in the abolition of donations.

SUMMARY OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

WITH all of its excellencies the form of government peculiar to the United States is not ideal. This conviction, into which the student of the times must inevitably come, is that strongly held by Professor Woodrow Wilson in his discussion of "Democracy and Efficiency," as found in the *Atlantic Monthly* (Boston) for March. "We have not escaped," he declares, "the laws of error that government is heir to. It is said that riots and disorders are more frequent amongst us than in any other country of the same degree of civilization; justice is not always done in our courts; our institutions do not prevent, they do not seem even to moderate, contests between capital and labor; our laws of property are no more equitable, our laws of marriage no more moralizing, than those of undemocratic nations, our contemporaries; our cities are perhaps worse governed than any in Europe outside the Turkish empire and Spain; crime defies or evades the law amongst us as amongst other peoples less favored in matters of freedom and privilege; we have no monopoly either of happiness or of enlightened social order. As we grow older, we grow also perplexed and awkward in the doing of justice and in the perfecting and safeguarding of liberty. . . . We have supposed that there could be one way of efficiency for democratic governments and another for monarchical. We have declined to provide ourselves with a professional civil service, because we deemed it undemocratic; we have made shift to do without a trained diplomatic and consular service because we thought the training given by other governments to their foreign agents unnecessary in the case of affairs so simple and unsophisticated as the foreign relations of a democracy in politics and trade; . . . we have hesitated to put our presidents or governors or mayors into direct and responsible relations of leadership with our legislatures and councils in the making of laws and ordinances, because such a connection between lawmakers and executive officers seemed inconsistent with the theory of checks and balances whose realization in practice we understood Montesquieu to have proved essential to the maintenance of a free government. Our theory, in short, has paid as little heed to efficiency as our practice. It has been a theory of non-professionalism in public affairs; and in many great matters of public action nonprofessionalism is nonefficiency." A new era has however suddenly dawned, bringing a "frontage toward the Orient," but not before we are ready. "No other modern nation has been schooled as we have been in big undertakings and the mastery of novel difficulties. We have become confirmed in energy, in resourcefulness, in practical proficiency, in self-confidence. We have become confirmed, also, so far as our character is concerned, in the habit of acting under an odd mixture of selfish and altruistic motives. . . . It is only just now,

however, that we have awakened to our real relationship to the rest of mankind. Absorbed in our own development, we had fallen into a singular ignorance of the rest of the world. The isolation in which we lived was quite without parallel in modern history." Through this we have come into an attitude of false self-confidence and self-sufficiency, as instanced in our views on the money question and on self-government itself. The new tasks we have undertaken will, however, transform us. They were destined inevitably to come, and are strangely opportune. "The East is to be opened and transformed, whether we will or no; the standards of the West are to be imposed upon it; nations and peoples which have stood still the centuries through are to be quickened and made part of the universal world of commerce and of ideas which has so steadily been a-making by the advance of European power from age to age. It is our peculiar duty, as it is also England's, to moderate the process in the interests of liberty; to impart to the peoples thus driven out upon the road of change, so far as we have opportunity or can make it, our own principles of self-help; teach them order and self-control in the midst of change; . . . secure for them, when we may, the free intercourse and the natural development which shall make them at least equal members of the family of nations." What we shall do promises also to affect ourselves. "The reactions which such experiments in the universal validity of principle and method are likely to bring about in respect of our own domestic institutions cannot be calculated or forecast. Old principles applied in a new field may show old applications to have been clumsy and ill considered. We may ourselves get responsible leadership instead of government by mass meeting; a trained and thoroughly organized administrative service, instead of administration by men privately nominated and blindly elected; a new notion of terms of office and of standards of policy. If we but keep our ideals clear, our principles steadfast, we need not fear the change." In other words, change does not mean dismemberment. "The world is at last ready to accept the moral long ago drawn for it by de Tocqueville," who "predicted the stability of the government of the United States, not because of its intrinsic excellence, but because of its suitability to the particular social, economic, and political conditions of the people and the country for whose use and administration it had been framed."

THE article upon "The Educational Value of the Bible," by E. W. Work, D.D., in the April number of the *Quarterly Review of the United Brethren in Christ* (Dayton, O.), is attractive in its presentation of important truth. Macaulay is instanced as recording his indebtedness to the Scripture; the testimony of Ruskin upon the same point is referred to; the statement is made that in the two volumes of Lowell's letters recently published are found references taken from twenty-five books in the Bible; and even Byron's mastery of style is attributed to his familiarity with the

English Bible. "The strong and simple Saxon of the King James Version is in part the secret of its charm. Experiments at improving the style of the Bible have been uniformly disastrous. In the year 1833 a clergyman in New England published a translation of the New Testament intended especially for the literary and cultured classes. 'Why,' said he, 'should the Christian Scriptures be divested even of decent ornament?' The following are some of his translations: 'When thou art beneficent, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand performs;' 'Contemplate the lilies of the field, how they advance;' 'At that time Jesus took occasion to say, "I entirely concur with thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth;"' 'Every plantation which my heavenly Father has not cultivated shall be extirpated;' 'Salt is salutary; but if the salt has become vapid, how can it be restored?' 'Be not surprised that I announced to thee, "Ye must be reproduced;"' 'For this the Father loves me, because I gave up my life to be afterwards resumed. No one divests me of it, but I personally resign it. I have authority to resign it, and I have authority to resume it;' 'There are numerous apartments in my Father's temple; if not, I would have informed you.' These illustrations will make it clear that to try to improve the style of the Bible is the same as trying to paint the lily or to beautify the sky." Of the educational value of the Scripture the author further says: "Some books touch us on the intellectual side, others on the emotional side, others still on the side of will or determination. The Bible touches us on all sides. No faculty of the mind is left out in the appeal which it makes. To-day it enters one door of the mind, and to-morrow another—or enters one door with one person, and another door with another person. This is what is meant by the variety of the Scripture, not mere variety in form, but intellectual variety such as relates itself most intimately to the mind and its changing moods, to life and its variant circumstances." And of the power of the Scripture to awaken religious life the author finally says: "From astonishing sources has come testimony to this power of the Bible to awaken a spiritual life. Men have tried preaching sermons from other books, but they were like 'painted ships on painted oceans.' It was poor Heine's testimony, man of rich intellect and wayward will: 'The reawakening of my religious feelings I owe to that holy book, the Bible. Astonishing! that after I have whirled about all my life over all the dance-floors of philosophy, and yielded myself to all the orgies of the intellect, and paid my addresses to all possible systems without satisfaction, like Messalina, after a licentious night, I now find myself on the same standpoint where poor Uncle Tom stands, on that of the Bible.'"

An instance of permissive hero-worship is found in "A Tribute to Verdi," as written by Pietro Mascagni, of Rome, and published in the *International Monthly* (Burlington, Vt.) for April. Of the period in

which the great composer wrote—who now leaves to the world “an inextinguishable patrimony of art”—the author says: “One might well say that destiny wished with the glorious existence of the *maestro* to perpetuate, in the midst of man, the glory of music, the grandiose epoch of melodrama, the famous historical period of our operatic theater, which gave to the nineteenth century the title of ‘Century of Melody.’ To that magnificent period Giuseppe Verdi belonged, together with Gioachino Rossini, Gaetano Donizetti, Vincenzo Bellini, to name only the greatest. History will record that that period was initiated eighty-five years ago with the ‘Barber of Seville,’ and was closed at the end of the last century with ‘Falstaff;’ and it will record, also, that Rossini was born in the eighteenth century and that Verdi died in the twentieth. O, the power of such genius which has for an entire century educated the hearts and minds of many generations! To-day all would seem finished, after the passing of the last of these great ones, if one did not think that there still remain their work and memory.” Of the industry of Verdi, which extended into extreme old age, and of his final devotion to religion, the author also adds: “Young men arose, and he followed them anxiously, full of hope in their first steps. Alas! his great dream was not to be realized. The young ones had taken the wrong way. He saw that the whole of his work had become almost barren; he saw the real danger for the national theater, so thought he would warn those who had lost their way, that he would call them back to the straight road, that he would save them and with them the future of Italian music. He knew he was old by the years he could count, but he felt still strong and vigorous, and that he could not overcome the fever for work. It was still his holy mission; so, at the age of eighty years, Verdi offered with ‘Falstaff’ the most marvelous example of intellectual power, and gave to the melodramatic theater the newest, the boldest direction. . . . He gave another and the very last proof of his feeling for the Italian school at the age of eighty-six with fire and exceptional faith, but it was not for the theater that he wrote. . . . When he arrived at the most momentous years of his existence he turned his thoughts once more toward religion, but he would not use in any way the new precepts, the dogmas, and reforms which to-day regulate church music. Impatient, as always, of every formula, he produced his last composition, calmly writing his ‘Pezzi Sacri’ (Sacred Pieces) with that same expression of sentiment so natural to him, and which, in its devotion and piety, assumes a very special character. Verdi, who will remain in the history of music as the strongest, the most sincere, and the most capable interpreter of human and dramatic sentiment, wished to leave men and earth with his soul full of prayer and piety. It was the last and the holiest sign of his mission as musician and as man, it was the last warning, it was the last inheritance which goes to swell the immense patrimony of art and of feeling, which the great master leaves to the Fatherland, and which will bring forth fruit gloriously.”

BOOK NOTICES.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

The New Epoch for Faith. By GEORGE A. GORDON, D.D., Minister of the Old South Church, Boston. 12mo, pp. 412. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

Any reader of Dr. Gordon's *The Christ of To-day*, and of *The Witness to Immortality in Literature, Philosophy, and Life*, is likely to take up this book with keen expectancy, and will probably finish it with the feeling that the author's latest is his greatest. However he may hesitate over some things in it, and disagree point-blank with others, he will not find it easy to break the unified reasoning of the book, and he may concede the propriety of applying to this volume Dr. Gordon's own words concerning Principal Caird's Gifford Lectures, *Fundamental Ideas of Christianity*, "Under new phrases and modes of treatment lie in fresh clearness wide expanses of important truth." The conviction which framed the title of this book is that, to-day, Christian faith has a new and larger chance for its essentials, the century's doubt having proved ultimately the justifier and confirmer of faith; and in the closing chapter on "Things Expected" the author indicates some of the great issues for which he confidently hopes. Whether we regard the movements of our times as he regards them or not, we cannot well deny that his tall watch-tower has a very wide outlook over the field. Freely confessing that the situation is greater than his vision, and its meaning vaster than his judgment, he as freely speaks his "honest and emphatic opinion concerning crises upon which he has looked through his own eyes and through all other available eyes." The author's hope, to follow this with a sequel volume on the conceptions of faith that come out of the nineteenth century, seems somewhat shadowed by what, we trust, is only a temporary failure of health, necessitating vacation from pastoral duties. This book *assumes* that the religious view of the universe is true, that God is present in human life and that he works for ends, that human progress is real and that man's world possesses imperishable worth. "Of man's universe the Incarnation is the center, and God in history, in society, in the redeemed but progressive life of mankind is the permanent aspect of the Infinite love." The second chapter is on "The Advent of Humanity," and begins by saying that the best word for the distinctive character of the nineteenth century is humanity; it has been marked by a surpassing advent of humanity. It is noted that the two greatest ideas of the modern world, the idea of a universe and the idea of a humanity, both had a religious origin. Long before Newton discovered the union of all material things under the omnipresent force of gravity; ages before modern physics had gathered the worlds of space into one infinite kingdom, religious insight had dated all things from

the divine will, and grounded all things in it. The idea of a universe came as the inevitable consequence of the idea of God. Through large inductions and wide generalizations modern science has vindicated this idea of unity; it has given unexpected richness and range to the religious intuition; yet it was religion, and not scientific investigation, that first gave to the race this great conception. And for the origin of the idea of humanity one must go to the same high source. The other civilizing forces of the world look to religion for the discovery that God "made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." The Christian apostle was justified by the historical fact when he connected the idea of a human race with the conception of men as sons of God. The Hebrew faith that men are made in the likeness of God is the ultimate source of the idea of humanity. Monotheism is the priceless gift of the Old Testament to the modern world. Of this tree of life the two great branches are that *all worlds* and *all men* are *one in the one perfect God*. Following this statement, the author points out some of the forces which have obstructed the recognition of the brotherhood of man, and some of the periods in which the idea of the unity of the race gained strength, and among modern witnesses to the advent of humanity names the French Revolution, the poetry of Robert Burns and the influence of literature, socialism, the transformation of science, the missionary interest, and the influence of the United States. A stimulating and provocative study is the third chapter on "The New Appreciation of Christianity," setting forth Christianity as the religion of man and of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. It closes by presenting Paul, the great Christian optimist of the first century, as the proper type and example for to-day. Paul comprehended the contradiction which the Roman empire presented in thought, in character, and in custom to the law of love in the kingdom of God; yet to the apostle the world was a world to be redeemed. He knew that the points of antipathy to his message were fundamental; yet he felt the forces in the imperial environment which were sympathetic to his gospel to be even more important, and he availed himself of those forces with tact and power. As at Athens, so everywhere, he began with the devoutness and the faith already in existence, and the altar to the Unknown God was the shrine upon which he unveiled the God and Father of Christ. Heathenism had a vast range of sympathy toward the new teacher, and the conquest that marks the career of this great man is due to the fact that by the power of the Spirit he laid a master's hand upon the side of the world sympathetic toward his purpose. The world of to-day also presents contradictions to the Christian ideal; and the unconquerable optimist, seeking the redemption of the world, will approach it on the side where it shows rudimentary or incipient sympathies toward the Christian purpose and message. The chapters following are on "The Discipline of Doubt" (showing the services of doubt to faith), "The Return of Faith" (showing that it is a return to the God and Father of Christ, is

due to a resurgence of conscious religious need, and is helped by the dominance of an idealistic philosophy), and "The New Help from History." This is not a text-book for the class room; here and there it parts company with some things still credible and valid; it is a scout's reconnaissance of regions wet with the fresh morning dew of the twentieth century. Some pages must be quoted. "The life of Jesus Christ is part of human history, it is part of the universe. And if one is seeking to discover the ultimate character of the universe, it can be little short of fatal to neglect its supreme manifestation. The idea of the Incarnation lives in the strength of the axiom of cause and effect. The cause must equal the product; Jesus Christ is not self-originated. In the highest metaphysics of theology he is still the begotten of the Father. His advent, his ministry, his passion, his whole character and career in this world need explanation. The principle of causation cries out for satisfaction here as elsewhere. Christ is a gift, a product, an effect, a manifestation of the universe; and to generalize upon the character of the universe in neglect of this supreme fact is, in the last degree, unphilosophical. In a lower sense this contention holds true also of the whole brotherhood of the brave, the good, the wise. They could not have been what they were without the endowment, the spirit, the opportunity, and the constant inspiration which they received at the hands of the universe. In the last analysis, therefore, they are witnesses for the universe. The motto written upon the forehead of every wise and just man is in the words: 'By the grace of God I am what I am.' . . . Man is the real witness for God; man at his best is the supreme evidence of the Spirit of God. The Incarnation is the only fair and adequate form in which to put the case of faith in behalf of the character of the universe before the jury of human intelligence." Again, in the same chapter: "Carlyle and Tennyson are better representatives of the spiritual meaning of the nineteenth century than Matthew Arnold and James Thomson, precisely because in the two first named the preparation for the new vision of spiritual reality is larger and more evident. Carlyle and Tennyson were both great doubters, but in both the negative movement was emphatically in the interest of discovery. Arnold surrendered more and more to doubt; while Carlyle and Tennyson, in their unceasing fight against unreality, became witnesses to substantial, benignant, abiding truth. Both have their deepest significance in their discontent with the world's vision of God, and in their strangely contrasted but common call to look more piercingly into the heart of things. Tennyson writes, 'My chief desire is to have a new vision of God.' Carlyle writes, 'The universe is full of love, and also of inexorable sternness and veracity; and it remains forever true that God reigns!'" In the chapter on "The Return of Faith" is this: "For about twenty years evolution was the romance of the intellectual world. The world was drunk with it, the season of inebriety was long, and the condition unusually heavy. Darwin, Wallace, Spencer, Lewes, Haeckel, Huxley, Tyndall, Fiske,

and scores of others were the names that monopolized attention. Evolution as an intellectual interest was universal and sovereign, and mainly, though not exclusively, in its materialistic form. Evolution was the fad of the intellectual world, and that means that it must surely pass. The mental organism of mankind could not endure this spell forever. The mood was too intense and one-sided to last. It spent its force twenty years ago; it no longer lives except in a transformed existence, and as a minister to interests mightier than itself. It has given place to the science that has at least the will to believe, and especially in Great Britain and America, to the idealistic movement in philosophy. A generation ago the majority, perhaps, of those of the medical profession who had obtained a European education were agnostics; the exact opposite of this may be said to be the case to-day. Materialistic science thirty years ago controlled the larger body of scientific students; to-day science is delightfully surprised by the fact of religion. The materialistic mood has exhausted itself." Again: "All theories of the universe are on probation; none of them is demonstrably true. This is the situation that gives faith its opportunity. Ultimate beliefs appeal for supporters by the evidence in favor of them, by their inherent reasonableness, and in one case by the additional claim of absolute nobility. Christian theism blends in its appeal these three voices. It is able to produce evidences of its truth that rise to high probability; it may confidently assert the inherent reasonableness of its interpretation of the universe; and in its highest form it adds the further attraction of utter nobility. The union of these three claims—evidence, reasonableness, worthiness—constitute the unique power of Christian theism over the mind of civilized man." Professor James's book, *The Will to Believe*, is recalled by what our author says concerning the option of faith: "Faith selects from the possibilities of the case the idea that is highest, that has the most and best to say for itself, and that is worthiest of support, as well as most supporting, during hours of darkness. Faith is essentially choice, at least it involves this function. It is a selection from among competing notions of the one that is likeliest to be true, and which, in the absence of complete proof, is best deserving of human devotion. And upon this ground there cannot be the least doubt as to the choice which an unfettered faith will make. The basis of the universe is either mental or nonmental, atheistic or theistic. . . . That cannot be true which if heeded would make impossible the noblest tradition of mankind. That cannot be true which if acknowledged would reduce to an idle dream the best in the thought and character of the race. Let the moral will defend itself and brand the materialism which would reduce it to folly as the superlative impostor. Between a universe grounded in mud and a universe based upon mind the choice and devotion of faith go to the latter. Thus faith makes its first disjunctive judgment. It must be either atheism or theism; it cannot be atheism, therefore it is theism." A unique feature of this book is the power it attributes to humor as a

discipline of saving common sense, a rectifier of errors, and a servant of truth. One chapter uses the story, given by Canon Liddon, of a Presbyterian minister who, in behalf of Queen Victoria, and in her presence, prayed thus: "Grant that as she grows to be an old woman she may be made a new man; and that in all righteous causes she may go forth before her people like a he-goat on the mountains." It is a mixture of reverent intention with ludicrous impropriety.

Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament. Eight Lectures on the Lyman Beecher Foundation, Yale University. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, United Free Church of Scotland, Glasgow College. 12mo, pp. 325. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

The air is full of biblical criticism, theological journals must discuss it and popular journals are perfectly willing to follow them. The preachers of all Churches have accepted a good deal of it, or are rather nervous about it and afraid to have anything to do with it. It is sad, but it is true, that not a few preachers have heard and read so much about Old Testament criticism that they are afraid to use the old books in the same way as before, lest some well-read hearer deem them ignorant of the new thought. They are afraid to preach about Moses, for they are not sure that criticism has really left the great fame of the mighty lawgiver altogether intact, and uneasily turn away to seek fields less marked by recent controversy. They have heard this bit of history doubted and that piece set in some new light, and their faith is really disturbed, unnecessarily disturbed indeed, but none the less really. What are such men to do? Practical affairs press too strongly upon them to permit their undertaking the elaborate study necessary to understand the problems and attain independence of judgment upon them. They must take criticism at second hand, and they need a guide. If a guide could be secured who was at once a critic and a preacher the ideal would surely be attained. Professor George Adam Smith, of Glasgow, is one of the foremost of modern biblical scholars. He has made original contributions to criticism, everywhere recognized as important; his book on the Geography of the Holy Land is the best on its subject, and he is withal a preacher of power and unction, swaying men with a powerful presentation of the Gospel of Christ. As a critic he knows what criticism is and how many of its results have found general acceptance. As a preacher he knows how far he has been personally able to use the results and how far they have modified his own message to men. In every respect he is qualified to introduce to preachers the modern historical and literary criticism, and to instruct them concerning its possible bearing upon their own message to men. The book contains eight lectures, with the following titles: The Liberty and Duty of Old Testament Criticism as Proved from the New Testament; The Course and Character of Modern Criticism; The Historical Basis in the Old Testament; The Proof of a Divine Revelation in the Old Testament;

The Spirit of Christ in the Old Testament; The Hope of Immortality in the Old Testament; The Preaching of Prophets to Their Own Times, with Some Account of Their Influence upon the Social Ethics of Christendom; The Christian Preacher and the Books of Wisdom. The first quality that the careful reader will perceive in this book is its tone of confident, optimistic conservatism in respect of the fundamentals of the Christian view of the Scriptures. Here, for example, is a representative paragraph: "I think it can be shown that criticism, so far from throwing doubts either upon the uniqueness of Israel's true knowledge of God, or upon the personal influence of God as producing this, certainly proves the former, and leaves us with the latter as its most natural and scientific explanation. Or to put this otherwise—the most advanced modern criticism provides grounds for the proof of a Divine Revelation in the Old Testament at least more firm than those on which the older apologetic used to rely." To this paragraph there is appended a footnote so important that we cannot forbear its quotation though it is long: "It would be very easy to prove the compatibility of belief in Revelation in the Old Testament with the results of modern criticism by simply citing the personal dicta of some of the most eminent critics. There is an idea abroad among Christians that the whole critical school are hostile to belief in Revelation. For this some critics, who avoid the question of Revelation even when their discoveries lead them to the verge of it, are partly to blame; but it would be readily dispelled by the explicit confessions of such belief by other critics, and these among the most able and advanced. Kuenen, in his collected Essays, approaches the question of Revelation in the Old Testament, yet never addresses himself to it. I stated this in a review of the German translation of the Essays (Kuenen's *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1894) in the *Expositor* (July–December, 1895), and the translator, Professor Budde, a pupil of Kuenen, and one of the most eminent of German critics, wrote me that the observation was right, but that as for himself his belief in 'a genuine revelation of God in the Old Testament remains rock-fast.' That belief has been shared and stated by a number of advanced critics. The late Professor Robertson Smith affirmed again and again his belief in the Divine Origin of the Old Testament, and in the last of his Burnett Lectures (unfortunately unpublished) proved 'the uniqueness of Hebrew prophecy and the impossibility of accounting for it by natural or historical reasons' (from a manuscript report of the last Burnett Lecture). Compare also *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 297." Expressions of similar assurance abound in the book. To some who are wavering and hesitant, fearful and disquieted amid modern critical struggles, the book will be a veritable tonic. But the careful reader will probably observe a second thing in the book. He will notice by the side of this optimism a perfect frankness in the statement of these new views. They are new, they are more or less in conflict with venerable traditions, they do involve a reconstruction in the inherited faith of most men, and Pro-

fessor Smith makes these facts perfectly plain. Let no man hastily accept them under the impression that it makes no particular difference one way or the other. It does make much difference, and each reader will do well to mark this carefully. Here is the modern critical view, and here is the manner in which a distinguished preacher uses it in the practical work of the ministry. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind, but let him not neglect to read this book if he desire an easy and attractive avenue into the field of criticism, or if he be already disturbed by questions to which his mind finds no ready answer.

Sunday, the True Sabbath of God; or, Saturday Proven to be Neither the Sabbath of the Old Testament nor the Sabbath of the Ancients who Lived before the Christian Era. Being a Complete Refutation of the Saturday-Sabbath Heresy and a Vindication of the Changeableness of the Day of the Sabbath. By SAMUEL WALTER GAMBLE, of Ottawa, Kansas, a Member of the South Kansas Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and a Field Secretary of the American Sabbath Union of New York City, etc. 12mo, pp. 203. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. New York: Eaton & Mains. Price, cloth, \$1.

In counteracting the teachings of the Seventh-day Adventists throughout the West the author of this volume has given conspicuous and useful service. Upon these Adventists he puts the responsibility of the defeat of the Blair "Sunday-Rest Bill," while their present efforts are directed toward "the repeal of all Sabbath laws, both in State and nation," these efforts being fortified by the voluminous outputs of two large publishing houses. The influence of these Adventists, according to Mr. Gamble, is most pernicious. Not only have they undermined the popular conviction upon the sanctity of the Sabbath, but they have also in the past seven years succeeded in doubling the amount of compulsory Sabbath labor, so that it is now "estimated that over four million American laboring men are compelled to labor every day alike, or risk being thrown out of employment if they refuse to labor on the Sabbath." Such is the evil influence which Mr. Gamble, in the intervals of a busy secretaryship, has aimed to antagonize by the writing of the present treatise. His position, in a word, is that the Sabbath has existed from the beginning, the day given to Adam in Eden having been Sunday and not Saturday, and that this Sabbath, having been kept for about eighteen centuries, was lost; that "after the confusion of tongues a great variety of Sabbath countings was instituted, which changed the Sabbath from twelve to thirty-six times a year from one day of the week to another;" that "God led the Egyptians into the nearest approach to the Edenic Sabbath, by enabling them to establish a fixed week of seven days, commencing with the day of Saturn and ending with a seventh-day Sabbath—Friday;" that God "gave the children of Israel a system of fixed-date Sabbaths, which changed once every year between the Exodus and the Crucifixion to a different day of the week, and hence that Saturday was never a Jewish Sabbath for over a year at any one time until after the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus;" that the Roman week "from before the birth of Christ to near the close of the fourth century

A. D. was eight days long, and hence that their Sabbaths changed forty-five times every year to a different day of the week; "and that Christ, "in fulfillment of prophecy, made the Sunday of his resurrection the Sabbath" which shall continue to the end and "become the Sabbath of all nations." Into the merits of Mr. Gamble's argument we may not enter. The titles of the successive chapters will, however, suggest the line of his discussion, as follows: "Brief Statement of Sabbath Doctrine," "Ancient Calendars and Ancient Methods of Sabbath Counting," "The True Bible Calendar," "Jewish Sabbaths, or the Sabbaths during the Jewish Dispensation," "Objections to the Jewish Sabbath Teachings Briefly Considered," "The Christian Sabbath Studied Negatively, or the Chief Arguments Against Sunday-Sabbath Observance Considered," and "The Christian Sabbath Positively, or the Christian Sabbath in Old Testament Prophecy and New Testament History." Besides his patient and scholarly treatment of the great subject under review, Mr. Gamble has inserted a chart which is as instructive as it is ingenious. His volume, whose Introduction is written by Bishop Fowler, deserves a place among the standard authorities.

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

Education and Life. By JAMES H. BAKER, LL.D. 12mo, pp. 284. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

Of these papers and addresses ten are under the head of "Education," and eight under the broader title. The first group includes a general view of the field, secondary education and its relation to the elementary and higher, some principles and problems of the elementary and secondary periods, higher education, and the practical bearing of all mental development. Such views as the following are presented: All education must be brought into closer touch with the work and the problems of to-day. The social aim in the preparation for citizenship must be given more prominence. Though mental power is the great need, it avails nothing without a content of knowledge. Because each field of knowledge has its own peculiar value the choice of studies during the period of general training is not matter of indifference. The studies in a given period should be good preparation for higher grades of work. The entire time between the first grade and college graduation must be shortened. We have suffered from false interpretation of the doctrines of pleasure, pursuit of inclination, punishment by merely natural consequences, and following lines of least resistance. A senior in college took for his electives Spanish, French, and lectures in music and art, merely because they were easiest—in the line of least resistance. A trenchant pen admonishes thus: "Soft pedagogics have taken the place of the old steep and rocky path to learning. But from this lukewarm air the bracing oxygen of effort is left out. It is nonsense to suppose that every step in education can be made interesting and pleasant." Prevailing educational methods give license to evasion, indolence, and dilettanteism.

In the presence of modern science both those who accept and those who refuse its teachings may agree to say, "Evolution must be interpreted, and the purpose of creation must be judged, not by the first struggle of a protozoan for food, but by the last aspiration and effort of man for heaven." Many fear that a practical, scientific age may destroy the poetry and romance of life. But Carlyle teaches truly that romance exists in reality, rather than in mythologies and fictions, "The thing that *is*, what else can be *so* wonderful?" And in a wonderful passage he adds: "In our own poor century man witnesses overhead the infinite deep, with lesser and greater lights, bright-rolling, silent-beaming, hurled forth by the hand of God; around him and under his feet the wonderfulest earth, with her winter snowstorms and summer spice airs, and (unaccountablest of all) *himself* standing here. He stands in the lapse of Time; he sees eternity behind him and before him." True and sure is the prophecy that the intellect of man will finally return from all its discoveries to say to the human soul: "Far and wide I have sought a basis for truth and found it not. Any philosophy that fails to recognize God is false. Search your inner consciousness. You are yourself God's highest creation. You see beauty in the flower and glory in the heavens; you have human love and sympathy and divine aspirations. Life to you is nothing without aim and hope. Trust your higher instincts!" In the chapter on "Plato's Philosophy" it is noted that Plato, regarding education, mental and moral, as the foundation of the state, wished to make it compulsory, and to give women the same training as men. These words are quoted from the conclusion of Plato's "Republic:" "My counsel is that we hold fast to the heavenly way and follow after justice and virtue always, considering that the soul is immortal. Thus shall we live, dear to one another and to the gods, both while remaining here and when like conquerors we go to receive our reward. And it shall be well with us both in this life and in the pilgrimage of a thousand years." Impressing the lesson that sentiment, feeling, and principle should culminate in action, the author says, "Do not allow your finer emotions to evaporate without finding expression in some useful act, if it is nothing but speaking kindly to your grandmother, or giving up your seat in a street car." He also says, "The whole curriculum of study, from the kindergarten to university graduation, should be a disclosure and impartation of ethical conceptions, a practice in right action, and an encouragement of right purpose." Our principal complaint against this book is that it over-values State universities and fails to do justice to denominational colleges. A wholesome chapter is that on "The Modern Gospel of Work," which says truly that Edwin Markham's "Man with the Hoe" is wrong at the foundation, not correct science, nor good philosophy, nor accurate history. It regards labor as a curse; but without the hoe the human race would be chimpanzees, savages, tramps, criminals. In human development no useful labor ever "loosened and let down the brutal

jaw," or "slanted back the brow," or "blew out the light within the brain," or deprived man of his birthright. By cultivating the soil man cultivates his soul. The hoe has been an indispensable instrument to the growth of intelligence, morals, and manhood. The same chapter has the following: "It is a scientific fact that prayer is for the health of the soul. It is useless to theorize upon the subject—men pray because it is their nature; they cannot help it. The Christian experience shows that prayer is a communion of man's spirit with God, the Spirit. John Fiske affirms the reality of religion. He argues that the religious idea has played the dominant part in history; that all the analogies of evolution show that man's religious nature cannot be an adjustment to an external nonreality; and concludes thus: "Of all the implications of the doctrine of evolution with regard to man, the very deepest and strongest is that which asserts the Everlasting Reality of Religion. That this is a world in which science is possible proves it a rational world; and the natural inference is that it has a rational Creator." Professor T. H. Green writes: "*That God is, Reason entitles us to say with the same certainty as that the world is or that we ourselves are.* What He is, it does not, indeed, enable us to say in the same way in which we make propositions about matters of fact, but *it moves us to seek to become as He is, to become like Him, to become consciously one with Him, to have the fruition of His Godhead.* In this sense it is that Reason issues in the life of Faith." It requires greater credulity to call the Christian experience an illusion than to accept its reality and validity. Here are some significant expressions: "Faith is the X-ray of the soul;" "Those who are overcome in the struggle may have their reward; at Thermopylae the Persians won the laurels, but the Spartans the glory;" "When you see a man of marked power you may always be sure that he has used means of self-discipline and development which the average man neglects to use." Tennyson's son testifies to his great father's "splendid faith in the growing purpose of the sum of life, and in the noble destiny of the individual man;" to his belief that "it is the great purpose which consecrates life;" to his feeling that "only with his 'sword bathed in heaven,' can a man combat the cynical indifference, the intellectual selfishness, the sloth of will, utilitarian materialism of a transition age;" to his conviction that "the truth must be larger, purer, nobler than any mere human expression or comprehension of it;" and to his affirmation that "if you take away belief in the self-conscious personality of God, you take away the backbone of the world." What a testimony to the worth of prayer, and Church, and Sabbath is in these lines from Goethe:

Once Heavenly Love sent down a burning kiss

Upon my brow, in Sabbath silence holy:

And, filled with mystic presage, chimed the church bells slowly,
And prayer dissolved me in a fervent bliss,

And, while a thousand tears were burning,
I felt a world arise for me.

The Map of Life. By WILLIAM EDWARD HARTPOLE LECKY. 12mo, pp. 353. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

An eminent historian of the philosophic type, in the late afternoon of life, records here the reflections which have arisen in his mind from a wide, long, patient survey of the human lot and character. It is a cool criticism of life and conduct, not overcynical for an old man—an unsentimental, unenthusiastic meditation, with something of Benjamin Franklin's practical philosophic temper. It begins with a discussion of happiness, defining it as a condition of mind, dependent on character and disposition more than on circumstances; the relation of wealth, and of morals, and of civilization to happiness; the importance of not making happiness the main object of pursuit, of seeking to avoid suffering rather than to attain pleasure, of filling life with work, and of remembering that the greatest pleasures are in spheres accessible to all. It is noted that improvement in character is more within our power than improvement of intellect, and that high moral qualities often go with low intellectual power; that progress in morals through centuries has been chiefly in the differing proportionate value attached to the various virtues. (Jesus set the world forward partly by exalting virtues and qualities which had been despised.) Lecky points out the reality of human depravity as illustrated by war, by the large amount of pure malevolence and cruel selfishness in the world, and by the mendacious and predacious practices of even civilized men. In several chapters he sets forth what he calls the necessity of moral compromise in life, and illustrates from history, with critical comments, the place which moral compromise has had in war, in the law, in politics, and in the Church. He discusses the ethics of war, its sufficient causes, lawful and unlawful methods of conducting it, the treatment of prisoners and of private property, and the binding force of a military oath. He reasons about a lawyer's temptations, how far an advocate may support a bad case, the license of cross-examination, and the defeating of justice by technicalities. He considers the difficulty of reconciling old formularies with changed beliefs, the growth of new ideas in the Church, modern ritualism and the sacerdotal spirit, how far clergymen may dissent from parts of a Church's theology and yet remain in it, the increasing sense of the relativity of belief, and the capacity of religion to undergo transformation. He emphasizes the necessity of training the will to mastery over desires and thoughts, showing its importance in all mental and moral culture. The difference in men, as to concentration and force, is largely a difference of will power. The last chapters treat of money, and marriage, and success, and time, and death. Speaking of the English, it is remarked that they do not dwell much on their emotions or indulge in free expression of them; demonstrations of sorrow or of joy are restrained; the custom of perpetuating grief by protracted mournings and by long retirement from the world is steadily diminishing. Similarly, English Protestantism lays less stress on the inner feelings than on

action; it discourages the habit of minute introspection which the Romish confessional promotes, which is so prominent in the writings of Catholic saints and of other mystics; and it regards improved conduct and the active service of worthy causes as the most trustworthy measures of spiritual progress. Speaking of the curious ways in which men seek and find enjoyment, it is narrated that Lord Althorp, near the end of his long parliamentary career, declared that the thing that had given him the greatest pleasure in life was to see sporting dogs hunt; which reminds us of a man, known to us, who lived eighty-five years, of whom his own son wrote with filial pride that the principal aim of his father's long life had been the improvement of his dogs; which recalls the woman whose relations with the cosmos were described thus, "Herself first, her pet dog a bad second, and the rest of the world nowhere." What low and trivial aims engage mankind, who ought to rise so high! Lecky does not agree with the antivivisectionists who oppose experiments on living animals and who would thus close the best hope of finding remedies for some of the worst forms of human suffering. Speaking of statesmanship, it is truly said that, under free institutions, the true statesman must be able to discern the people's wish; as a French writer puts it, "The great art consists not in hearing those who speak, but in hearing those who are silent;" not in listening to intrusive, self-seeking, ambitious, and voluble politicians, but in knowing what the *people* think and want, and then executing the people's will "as lightnings do the will of God." It was Lincoln's habit when the politicians were babbling and whispering to him, to lay his ear to the ground for the murmur of the will of the great American public. Sometimes he called Matthew Simpson from his constant mingling with men in all parts of the Union to tell him what the people were saying among themselves about the course of the government. The friends of the President now in the White House, who has been called "an opportunist" and accused of having no policy, point out that in this respect he is like Lincoln, conceiving his duty to be not to execute his own will and preference, but to obey the will of the people, after having taken all possible pains to ascertain what that will, from time to time, is. Pertinent, just here, are Lecky's words about a statesman's difficulty in steering his way between rival fanaticisms—"the fanatics who pardon everything if it succeeds and conduce to the pride of empire, and who act as if weak powers and savage nations had no moral rights; and the fanatics who seem to have a leaning against their own country, and who imagine that in times of war, anarchy, or rebellion, and in dealing with savage or half-savage military populations, it is possible to act with the same respect to the technicalities of law, and the same invariable high standard of scrupulousness, as in a peaceful age and a highly civilized country." The present German emperor is censured for hastening to Constantinople, so soon after the Armenian massacres, to clasp the Sultan's hand, so deeply stained

with innocent Christian blood, and then proceeding to the Mount of Olives to proclaim himself, with melodramatic piety, the patron and champion of the Christian faith! Our author says that the scientific doctrine of evolution is in no degree inconsistent with the belief either in a Divine and Creative origin of things or in a settled and Providential plan. Concerning the roominess of the Church of England, Lecky writes: "There are to be found within it men whose opinions can hardly be distinguished from Deism or Unitarianism, and men who abjure the name of Protestant and are only divided by the thinnest partition from the Romish Church. And this diversity exists in a Church which is held together by articles and formularies of the sixteenth century." Speaking of the efficacy of Christian Churches in promoting that spiritual life which, whatever men may say of it, is at least one of the great realities of human nature, the author says: "The power of a religion is *not* to be mainly judged by its corporate action, by the institutions it creates, or by the part it plays in the government of the world. It is to be found much more in its action on the individual soul, and especially in those times and circumstances when man is most isolated from society. It is in furnishing the ideals and motives of individual life; in guiding and purifying the emotions; in promoting habits of thought and feeling which rise above the things of earth; in the comfort it can give in age, sorrow, disappointment, and bereavement; in seasons of sickness, weakness, declining faculties, and approaching death, that its power is most felt. No one creed or Church has a monopoly of this power, though each has often tried to identify it with something peculiar to itself. It may be found in the Catholic and in the Quaker, in the High Anglican who attributes it to his sacramental system, and in the Evangelical in whose eyes that system holds only a very subordinate place." He thinks that religion's deepest roots are less in the reason of man than in his sorrows and his affections, and that religion is preeminently "the expression of wants, moral appetites, and spiritual aspirations, which are an essential, indestructible part of his nature." How life's needs are in league with the preacher to press men toward religion, is indicated in this passage: "Young men often discuss religious questions simply as matters of intellectual debate; but later in life they more frequently accept their creed as a working hypothesis of life; as a consolation in innumerable calamities; as the one supposition under which life is not a melancholy anticlimax; as the indispensable sanction of moral obligation; as the reflection and gratification of needs, instincts, and longings which are planted in the deepest recesses of human nature; as one of the chief pillars on which society rests." Our author shows his ignorance in accepting as a fact the alleged tendency of the children of clergymen to go conspicuously to the bad. No slander can be more easily and completely disproved by investigation anywhere and everywhere; for it has been conclusively ascertained that no other class of children so generally show a strong tendency to go

conspicuously to the good and to rise to positions of eminent usefulness and honor. We end this notice of a generally judicious book with this touching epitaph from a German churchyard: "I will arise, O Christ, when thou callest me; but O! let me rest awhile, for I am very weary!"

Modern Methods of Church Work. By REV. GEORGE WHITEFIELD MEAD. 12mo, pp. 363. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. Price, cloth, \$1.50.

This book, though not just from the press, is as valuable as on the day of its first issue. There is a prevalent feeling among all Churches that some old methods of Christian work are now unsuitable and ineffective. Results from their use are not satisfactory. In the business world methods are changed continually to meet changed conditions. The conditions amid which the Church labors for its success change also, and the same alertness, inventiveness, and readiness to employ new methods and agencies, are required if any hope of success is to be entertained. No Church ought to be less tied up to mere custom and form, and more vigilant and quick to vary and improve its methods, than our own; for Methodism began as an almost revolutionary innovation in methods and plans of work, amid a storm of criticism from the custodians of customs and precedents. Our Church should always allow room for the spontaneous play of versatile inventive genius eagerly bent on adapting means to ends for the solving of problems and the salvation of men. Let there be liberty for ardent and intrepid men to try all sorts of decent expedients. Let us not find fault with methods because they are new. Agile adaptability to an infinite variety of situations and populations has characterized Methodism. Let us exact of Christian workers zeal and success; to this end let us leave them free as to methods, not tying them up with the red-tape of custom. We are the servants and imitators of a God who "fulfills himself in many ways." The Introduction in the book before us refers to the magnificent adventurousness of those great days when the Wesleys broke through all precedents and horrified a conventionalized Church by their unprecedented and unsanctioned methods of going after the multitudes to reach and gain, and save them. Their marvelous success was their overwhelming vindication. With a sacrificial spirit as changeless as the purpose of Christ to save the world, the Church's ways of working must be flexible to fit every new occasion. The spirit of the free workman, impatient of restraints and hampers, is typified in Phillips Brooks chafing against the rubrics, dashing down the Prayer Book that he might, upon occasion, pour out the hot, tumultuous, unlimited passion of his sanctified soul in spontaneous prayer, and discarding his sacerdotal robes at times that he might stand and talk directly, as man to man upon the street, as brother conversing appealingly with brothers on a level, unisolated by peculiar garb. This is a timely book; it will help to make a larger one like it necessary in a decade. It tells of a large variety of methods which have been tried by various workers of various communions, in different places, and fully

describes them. Many experiments are being tried, risking mistakes on the basis of the conviction of Frederick W. Robertson when he said, "He is not the best Christian or the best general who makes the fewest mistakes; but he is the best who makes the most splendid victories by learning wisdom from his mistakes and retrieving his false steps." The greatest of all mistakes is not to try other methods when any given method fails. These forty-four chapters present a large volume of instructive, suggestive, and stimulating information, which it will profit any Christian minister or layman to read and study. The range of subjects is extensive: "The Free, the Open, and the Institutional Church," "Reaching People Outside the Church," "Reaching Strangers at the Services," "The Ushers," "The Choir," "Men's Clubs," "The Sunday Evening Service," "The After Meeting," "The Pleasant Sunday Afternoon," "Young People's Societies," "Prayer Meetings," "Cottage Prayer Meetings," "Open-Air Preaching," "Rural Evangelization," "Reaching and Holding Young Men," "Reading-Rooms, Literary Societies, and Entertainment Courses," "Women's Work," "Work with Girls and Young Women," "The Social Problem of the Church," "The Children of the Church," "The Sunday School," "Lectures to Boys Only," "The Boys' Club," "The Boys' Brigade," "Industrial Classes," "Kindergartens," "Temperance Work," "Dispensaries," "Diet Kitchens," "Deaconesses," "Beneficiary and Loan Associations," "The Plural Pastorate," "The Free-Pew and Voluntary-Offering System," "Church Programmes, Bulletins, and Advertising," "Church Architecture, New Styles," "Results of New Methods." A mere glance at this enumeration of new agencies and instrumentalities must impress the most superficial reader with the immense fertility and intense activity of the Christian Church, and so inspire hope for the future. Yet alertness, consecration, and energetic effort are far from being as prominent and prevalent in Zion as they should be, and there is still in many places too much reason for deploring, with Phillips Brooks, the "awful sluggishness of Christendom," the "terrible torpidity of the Christian Church," and for praying with him that "God may come near to us this very year and give us a great, true revival of religion."

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

A History of Babylonia and Assyria. By ROBERT WILLIAM ROGERS, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., F.R.G.S., Professor in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, New Jersey. 2 volumes, 8vo, pp. xx, 429, xv, 418. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye. Price, cloth, \$5.

The science of one of the most ancient of historical subjects is still young. It was the University of Berlin that first gave recognition to the science of Assyriology, by creating a chair and appointing to it Eberhard Schrader, an Old Testament scholar, who was the first man in all the world to become Professor of Assyriology. It is interesting to note

how much this modern science owes to its first professor. Schrader's pupils are his testimonial and his crown. Out of his class room came Friedrich Delitzsch, the philologist, who wrote the first complete Assyrian grammar and made the first complete Assyrian dictionary. Delitzsch transmitted the impulse received from Schrader to one of his own pupils, Fritz Hommel, of Munich, who issued at Berlin, in 1885, an important *History of Babylonia and Assyria*. It was also under the inspiration of Schrader's exposition of the historical value of modern oriental discoveries that Dr. C. P. Tiele, a theological professor in the University of Holland, published at Gotha, in 1886, his *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte*. Then, in 1892, another of Schrader's pupils, Hugo Winckler, wrote a suggestive and ingeniously speculative book, *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*. And now comes Robert W. Rogers, also, be it noted, one of Schrader's pupils, with a history supplementing the others and in many items correcting them with his fuller and later knowledge—a history worthy to rank with either of the three great books above mentioned, and surpassing them in some important and easily noticed particulars. Of scientific books devoted exclusively to the history of Babylonia and Assyria, Hommel, Tiele, and Winckler had, until now, produced the three most notable, to which this work of Professor Rogers may be said to add itself as the fourth in line, extending, rectifying, and completing up to date the work of his predecessors. This is not saying that there are not other books of value touching the history of Babylonia and Assyria, but they treat that history in connection with the history of other oriental peoples, and generally with other than purely historical purpose. Of the three great works above named, Hommel's is nearest akin to, and most natural to be compared with, this new work by Professor Rogers. One of the chief values of Hommel's work is its good account of the discovery and decipherment of inscriptions, of which there is no account whatever in Tiele or Winckler. But Hommel's account extends only to 1885, and fills only seventy-seven pages, while Rogers's account is to 1900 and occupies two hundred and fifty-three pages. Hommel has nothing at all about the decipherment of Vannic or Chaldian texts and very little about the Sumerian question, upon which Professor Rogers gives in chapter vii, Vol. I, what Professor Sayce pronounces "a clear and admirable summary." Moreover Hommel often refers only second hand to early documents to which he had no access, while Rogers has examined and diligently studied them all, so that his references to them are all at first hand. Hommel's account of early discovery begins with Pietro della Valle about 1618 A. D.; but Dr. Rogers shows (Vol. I, pp. 3-5) that it really began with Odoric about 1320 A. D., and besides adds to those previously known to Hommel the names of Barbaro, Antonio de Gouvea, and Don Garcia de Sylva y Figueroa. These last and other items of value in the book before us have been noticed and credited by Dr. William Hayes Ward, director of the Wolfe expedition to Babylonia (which went from New York in 1884, its expenses being defrayed by Miss Cath-

arine L. Wolfe), especial praise being also given to Professor Rogers's account of the dynasties and successive rulers of Babylonia and Assyria, the story of which is graphically told and the relation to Egyptian and Jewish history well brought out. *The Independent*, of which Dr. Ward is editor, says, "We are compelled to pay tribute to the faithfulness of investigation, the largeness of view, the breadth of knowledge, the general soundness of critical discernment, and the succinct compactness by which a large field is brought within reasonable compass in this eminently readable book." Professor Gilmore, of Meadville Theological School, in *The New World* for December, 1900, noting many excellences in this book, says that the data for the chronology of the subject have never been better set forth. Not only is this true, but it is a fact that never before has all the chronological material been assembled in one place, annotated, explained, and sifted. This unprecedented achievement is in Vol. I, chapter xii. Professor Gilmore says that a serviceable bibliography of the best books in English on Babylonian and Assyrian history would be Maspero's three huge volumes, *Dawn of Civilization*, *Struggle of the Nations*, and *Passing of the Empires*; McCurdy's work, *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments* (the third volume of which will soon be noticed in our pages, as the previous volumes have been); and these two volumes by Robert W. Rogers. As to the style in which this book is written, it should be said that scientific works do not aim at rhetoric or literary elegance, and that much use of foreign languages, ancient and modern, with constant translating of archaeological inscriptions, might well result in an un-English style. But while Dr. Rogers has lived much with the modern languages which have given him immediate access to the European literature of his subject, and also with Assyrian, his mastery of which is shown by the scholarship in cuneiform contained in his book, yet Professor Gilmore justly commends our author's style, which is most effective for its purpose, being not cumbrous, but characterized by short, direct, lucid sentences, and free from obscure periods. It is widely known that few if any men have such power to interest audiences by lectures on ancient historical themes as Professor Rogers manifests in making archaeological research and discovery seem perfectly fascinating even to uninstructed hearers who might be expected to find such subjects dull; and he has written his history similarly, in a vivid and living way. It is impossible not to notice that the book is a marvel of condensation. Dr. Talcott Williams, himself an orientalist, says that our author stands among the few who have made a vast field accessible to the general public; that in these two laborious and exhaustive volumes an inestimable service has been rendered by collating what is valuable from an enormous amount of matter scattered in hundreds of publications relating to a period of history twice as long as the Christian era, and by adding new matter from some fields in which the author is an original and independent investigator. In this, continues Dr. Williams, American scholarship presents an achievement which is of the

highest usefulness. *The Critic* for March, 1901, noticing the extraordinary power of condensation, of which we are speaking, says that, in Dr. Rogers's book, the gist of volumes sometimes lies in four lines of a footnote. The necessity for compression would alone prevent an elaborate or graceful style; but such a style, as already remarked, is not to be expected, nor even desired, in a scientific work like the one before us. And it may not be amiss to say that this power to go through vast accumulations of matter on any great subject, judging each item and opinion with a sifting judgment, rejecting the nonessential and retaining the essential, and finally compressing the whole result of the sifting and selecting process into a nutshell in a masterful way, is one of the supreme tests of intellectual ability. The strong minds have a monopoly of the process of mental distillation. Rogers's *History of Babylonia and Assyria* could not have been made without the fine enthusiasm of the genuine scholar, which nerves to arduous undertakings and sustains through long and exhausting labors, nor without the acuteness of mind and tireless patience which qualify for successful research, nor without the conservatism of the trained historical critic. This notice may well conclude by quoting *The New World's* reference to the appearance of these volumes, which is a deserved tribute to our publishing house: "We have as usual to speak well of the publisher's part. The Methodist Book Concern, with its large and constant *clientèle*, can afford new type, excellent paper, good sewing, substantial covers, careful proof reading; and it furnishes them. These volumes are no discredit even to them."

The Clergy in American Life and Letters. By DANIEL DULANY ADDISON. 12mo, pp. 400. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, \$1.25.

How typical of the reckless insolence of infidelity that Thomas Paine should have told George Washington to his face, "You are treacherous in private friendship and a hypocrite in public life!" How easy the task of this volume to show that the clergy have exercised a mighty uplifting influence upon American life from the first! "If Christianity has been a power in the land in developing conscience and inspiring rectitude of character, it has been due in large measure to the ministers. They have had a hearing in every hamlet—on one day in seven when the children, the ignorant, and the men of education and of power have heard them. They have thus sustained a sense of the divine source of duty, and led their hearers into the presence of universal moral forces." Our colleges and schools were originated by them. Every great reform has been led by them, and every noble cause has found in them its spokesmen and pleaders. The children reared in their homes have filled the highest spheres of usefulness and power. Among the colonial clergy of New England were many rugged yet beautiful characters whose influence controlled the life of the region. A typical man was Ezra Stiles, elected president of Yale College in 1777, a learned scholar in Arabic, Syriac, and Persian, who at Commencement sometimes deliv-

ered a Hebrew oration in the morning and a Latin one in the afternoon. He hesitated about accepting the college presidency, saying, "The diadem of a president is a crown of thorns." Abiel Holmes, of Cambridge, in whose library the boy, Oliver Wendell, bumped about among folios as tall as himself, was a man of note, wise, delightful, and sunny, though the boy remembered some ministerial visitors to his father's house "with meager throats and a funeral service in their physiognomies." Samuel Hopkins, taught in Jonathan Edwards's household, softened the sterner features of his master's teaching, giving greater prominence to the equity of God and the beauty of holiness; but his most memorable work was against slavery, against which he fulminated before the nineteenth century came in. When he first startled his congregation in Newport by urging the setting free of the slaves, Whittier truly says, "It may well be doubted whether on that Sabbath day the angels of God, in their wide survey of the universe, looked upon a nobler spectacle than that of the minister of Newport, rising up before his slaveholding congregation and demanding, in the name of the Highest, the deliverance of the captive." Among the clergy in theological literature, in recent years, Charles Hodge is a name of note, his chief monument being his *Systematic Theology*, a comprehensive work in four parts, embracing theology, anthropology, soteriology, and eschatology, with no attempt at originality. He said proudly that "Princeton had never been charged with originating a new idea," in a pride like that of Dr. Shedd, when he said concerning his own book, "There is not a new thing in it—nothing less than several hundred years old." Worthy to stand in ability beside Hodge are Elisha Mulford's two remarkable books, *The Nation* and *The Republic of God*. The latter, called "An Institute of Theology," deals with reasons for the being of God, and the relations of religion and philosophy to the revelation of God, the Incarnation, the redemption of the world, and the life of the spirit. It presents a complete survey of the noblest conceptions of humanity, history, and the Christian religion, with all the aid to be received from a frank acceptance of the scientific contributions to theology. It comes nearest of American books to being a systematic treatment of Christianity in the light of modern thought. The main features of Mulford's theology are the indwelling of the Spirit of God in humanity and Christ's organic relations with man, the Incarnation being the natural revelation in history of the character of God. Sin is bondage to the order of nature, and redemption is the elevation of the soul into the life of the spirit. After giving four chapters to the influence of the clergy in American life, and as writers of history, poetry, romance, and religious literature, the book before us gives six to as many conspicuous figures of the American pulpit, selecting Timothy Dwight, William Ellery Channing, Theodore Parker, Horace Bushnell, Henry Ward Beecher, and Phillips Brooks. From these studies a few morsels are taken. A painful affliction of the eyes for many years compelled the first President Timothy Dwight

to dictate letters, sermons, poems, everything he committed to paper, resulting in a style described by Moses Coit Tyler as "composition by the tongue, rather than the pen; the style of an eloquent declaimer with the audience before him; clever improvisation—affluent, emphatic, sonorous, moving on in balanced numbers." Young Channing was for a short time tutor in a family at Richmond, Virginia, where he much enjoyed Southern warmth and hospitality, writing home: "Here I find great vices, but virtues greater than I left behind me. There is one single trait in these people which I admire more than all the virtues of New England; they love money less, they are more disinterested." But he found slavery very depressing, and said, "This alone would prevent me from settling in Virginia." Urging earnestness of manner in the pulpit, Channing once said: "I do not mean that a minister must have lungs of iron and a voice of thunder. Noise and earnestness are very different things. I only mean that a minister should deliver his message as if he felt its infinite weight, and this he may do without being a brawler." Of Channing, Theodore Parker wrote, "A most delightful man, full of the right spirit—a little diseased in the region of consciousness, but otherwise of most remarkable beauty of character." Horace Bushnell describes the humble home where he was born, as one of those "primitive universities of homespun," where hard manual labor was dignified by sturdy character and religious training. In Europe for health, Bushnell noted that Lord John Russell in Parliament said "havin'" and "walkin';" and that Thiers was a most enthusiastic orator, "gesturing up and down with both hands as fast as he could." One of the civic questions on which Bushnell did warlike service was the appropriation of public moneys to parochial schools. Such schools, he held, were no more than private schools, and it would be unwise and wrong to give money from the public funds to private institutions. It might be demanded next that the State appropriate money for schools to teach the Mormon Bible. When some one remarked concerning a certain humdrum, sluggish preacher, "I knew him when he was a boy doing chores for his board," Bushnell commented, "That's what he's doing now." Of Bushnell, Austin Phelps said, "He was a looker on and up, to the firmament of truth, and whatever he saw there he proclaimed to the waiting multitudes below." It is fortunate that Henry Ward Beecher early got out of staid New England and was flung out into the freer, rough, leaping, pioneering West. The life of saddlebags, and river fording, and schoolhouses, and camp meetings in which he shared, had much to do with developing his mighty youth and rousing his great powers to free and natural action. But for this, there would never have been a "Lion of Plymouth Pulpit." It was the Western wilderness that taught him to shake his mane and let out his roar. In the little settlement of Lawrenceburg, Ohio, was his first parish, of which he has told: "I was my own sexton. There were no lamps in the church, so I bought some, and filled them and lit them. I swept the

building and kindled the fire. The only reason I did not ring the bell was that there was none to ring." All his life he laid great stress on the importance to the preacher of health, sleep, and the open air. We once heard him say: "If I reach home on Saturday, tired with travel and work, I do not go to my study; I go to bed, and sleep as long as I can, if it is till thirty minutes to church time Sunday morning. Then I can make more and better preparation with a rested brain in fifteen minutes, than I could have done by cudgelling a tired brain for twelve hours in my study." He urged a certain healthful bravery in preaching, saying, "A congregation knows when a minister is afraid of them, just as well as a horse knows that his driver is afraid of him." Of some sermons he said they were built like the ships down in Maine: "They build them by the mile, and when they have an order they cut off as much as is required, and round off a stern and a bow. Thus some sermons seem to have been built by the mile; there seems to be no earthly reason why the preacher should begin in one place rather than in another." Dr. Holmes said, "The way a man handles his egotisms is a test of his mastery over an audience." Beecher was as frank as a great child, but his egotisms were never used for self-glorification, but only to illustrate and vivify the truth he was unfolding. How just was his tribute to the spiritualizing and hallowing influence of the much maligned Puritan Sabbath: "The one great poem of New England is her Sabbath. Through that she has escaped materialism. That has been the crystal dome overhead through which imagination has been kept alive. The glory of New England's imagination is to be found—not in art or literature—but in her inventions, her social organism, and, above all, in her religious life." Of Puritanism Phillips Brooks, the last great figure in this volume, said with similar admiration: "There is always showing itself out of the depths of Puritanism that great public spirit which meddles with the things of all the earth and which will show its force when that force is called for. It stands like a rusty gun in a corner of the room; but let no one ever fool with Puritanism, thinking it is not loaded, for by and by it will go off." Brooks spoke of Luther and Cromwell as the two men "on whom, more than on any others, the great gates seem to turn and open which let the race through from the old world into the new." When Phillips Brooks was a college boy at Harvard his tastes were for history, languages, poetry, with marked inability for mathematics and metaphysics. His first attempt in active life was as teacher in the Boston Latin School, and a most dismal failure. The head master, Francis Gardner, received his resignation with the severe and disheartening remark that he had never known a man who failed as a schoolmaster to succeed in any other occupation. And then the hand of Providence led the mortified young giant away by the path of humiliation toward his holy mission and his illustrious destiny. A bitter dose of mortification is sometimes a good tonic to begin with. One of the secrets of this great preacher's

power was the unity, the intensity, the concentrated coaction of all his powers in all he did. This is in his words, "Truth, when it is won, is the possession of *the whole nature*. By the *whole nature* only can it be gained;" and also in these, "I have done my work, so far, not as mere headwork, but as the completest possible expression of my personal being that I am capable of." There it is! And when he spoke, the passion of his whole being drove the words, and every drop of his blood went with the force of what he said. Our readers see that this is an interesting and inspiring book.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Bible Tragedies. By GEORGE CLARKE PECK. 12mo, pp. 172. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Fye. Price, cloth, \$1.

The son of Dr. J. O. Peck dedicates to his mother this vivid volume of Sunday evening sermons, and sends them forth, he says, "diffidently, yet with the earnest hope of diminishing the tragedies which fill a father's heart with sorrow and a beautiful world with gloom." Any reader of them (and they deserve many) must feel that they are eminently, one might say singularly, calculated to do what the author hopes. Dr. Mains says truly in his "Introductory Word" that these discourses are illuminated with a wealth of illustrative material drawn from fresh and vital sources, abound in vivid and pointed lessons for practical living, and contain nothing hackneyed. One is not surprised that they were eagerly listened to by crowded congregations. The eight Bible tragedies here discoursed about are those of "The Forbidden Fruit," "The Quails," "The Spoil," "The Unseen Hand," "An Ancient Gallows," "A Charger," "The Uninvested Pound," and "The Silver Pieces." The sermons are forcible and faithful, driven by the push of an enkindled mind and an earnest heart. The purpose to save and help men and women burns manifestly through them all. Their scholarship does not make them academic, their theology does not skeletonize them, their familiarity with literature does not make them bookish, their knowledge of history does not antiquate or make them mindful chiefly of the dead past. All these are only used as implements for touching immediately, movingly, and helpfully the throbbing, struggling, and imperiled human lives of the men and women and young people now sitting in the pews before the preacher. These urgent, incisive, and appealing utterances do not belong to such a ministry as is thus described: "I have heard men preach whose deliverances seemed set to music. They had all the equipment that earth can offer. They were engaged in the most wonderful work that human hands can touch—teaching human hearts the way of life. And yet their ministries were 'sweetness wasted.' They carried no citadels of sin. For they came to their work without that spiritual equipment which alone can qualify a man to preach his Master's Gospel."

